LIBRARY
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

THE Nation

VOLUME 149 NEW YORK · SATURDAY · DECEMBER 23, 1939 NUMBER 26

The Shape of Things

WHY DID HITLER ORDER THE SCUTTLING OF the Graf Spee? It is true the action is in accordance with a rather petulant German tradition notably illustrated at Scapa Flow, but it hardly measures up to the Nazi conception of the heroic life. Are Wotan's halls open to those who disdain battle when the odds are heavily against them? The incident might be easier to explain by reference to Hitlerian psychology rather than Hitlerian philosophy. For the latter was a pretty badly damaged craft last August when Hitler decided to scuttle it and seek safety first via the Russian pact. From the angle of domestic propaganda, the Graf Spee's suicide may be less awkward to handle than its internment or its sinking in battle. The Germans are a literal people, and had the pocket cruiser gone down fighting, however gloriously, it would have been difficult to convince them that the German navy had not suffered defeat. But the scuttle can perhaps be pictured as a cunning maneuver to rob the British hounds of their prey, and, moreover, it can be said that Uruguayan insistence on the ship's departure deprived her of a fair chance. So far as Winston Churchill is concerned, we have no doubt he is well satisfied. His main object, which was to put a dangerous commerce raider out of the way, has been accomplished fairly economically. If the Graf Spee had put up another fight, the end would no doubt have been the same, but more valuable lives might have been lost and valuable ships damaged.

✳

ANGLO-FRENCH ECONOMIC COOPERATION has been greatly strengthened by the new agreement for the pooling of financial resources and the stabilizing of currencies. Until six months after the peace treaty the rate of exchange is to be pegged at 176½ francs to the pound, which means that francs can be freely used throughout the British Empire, and sterling throughout the French Empire, without any exchange risk. It is, in effect, a monetary union of the world's two largest empires which should do much to assist the most economical use of Allied resources. The agreement also provides for joint participation in any foreign loans which may become available and for constant consultation on the employment of gold and dollar resources. This may lead to steps to bring the official and unofficial exchange rates between the dollar and the Allied currencies into a closer relation. At present there is a gap of about 10 cents between the Bank of England's quotation for dollars and the market rate in New York—a discrepancy which is a definite hindrance to trade. An important feature of the new Anglo-French agreement is an undertaking not to impose fresh restrictions on each other's imports either for protective or exchange reasons. Since the economies of the two countries are complementary to a considerable extent, there is much to be said for a mutual abolition of import duties. Such a move would certainly be a great help in holding down the cost of living in both countries, and by bringing price levels into a closer relationship, would make the maintenance of the pegged exchange rate easier. However, the war strain will probably have to increase a good deal before so revolutionary a step becomes practical politics.

✳

THE PROMISE TO OPEN THE YANGTZE RIVER is clearly a stage play on the part of the Japanese to persuade the United States not to impose an embargo at the expiration of the trade treaty next month. In itself it is a meaningless gesture since all trade in the occupied areas of China moves through Japanese-controlled monopolies which have the full backing of the Japanese military forces. Foreign exchange also is under the complete control of the Japanese authorities. During the next few weeks we may expect a certain amount of trade to develop for reasons of political exigency. But as long as the military occupation continues, such trade will be entirely on the sufferance of the Japanese and can be cut off at any moment. In commenting on the renewed conversations between Ambassador Grew and Foreign Minister Nomura the Japanese press continues to stress the possibility of settling outstanding incidents between the United States and Japan but contains no hint of a fundamental change in policy which would serve as a safeguard against future incidents. Recent dispatches from Shanghai anticipate early seizure by Japan of the customs houses at Shanghai and Tientsin, long under international administration, and suggest that new incidents are almost inevitable. The Chinese victories at Kaifeng, Nanchang, and in the vicinity of Nanning may do more to soften Japanese policy than any spontaneous change of heart at Tokyo.

Published weekly and copyright, 1939, in the U. S. A. by The Nation, Inc., 55 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter, December 18, 1897, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1897.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PLIGHT OF THE SPANISH REFUGEES IN France has been rendered graver than ever by the French government's action in raiding the S. E. R. E., the official Spanish agency for aiding the refugees to emigrate to foreign countries. This leaves them dependent on immediate foreign aid if any appreciable number are to escape the Franco terror. Already 360,000 of the 500,000 persons who fled before Franco last spring have been forced back into Spain. Others are being returned daily. Most of those who have gone back so far are non-combatants—old men, women, and children. But nearly all of the remaining 140,000 are former militiamen who on return must face a Franco firing squad or a slower death in a concentration camp. It is estimated that at least one-third of them will meet immediate execution. Among the few children who remain are some score who were injured when their frantic mothers threw them through the windows of a moving train rather than see them returned to Spain. To make matters worse for those still in France, the French government has seized some of the equipment and supplies sent the refugees from abroad. It has forced Spaniards who had settled in villages throughout France back into concentration camps, where few have adequate clothes for winter. Blankets are non-existent in some of these camps. Food is universally bad. Meanwhile, across the border the terror continues. The press of the provincial towns regularly publishes lengthy lists of the executed. In welcome contrast to the usual news we learn from Rome that the death sentences of two Basque priests have been commuted to thirty years' imprisonment. But the same source reports that fifty priests are being held in a single prison—the Carmona Prison in Andalucia. Thus is Franco preserving Christianity in Spain.

*

SO FAR THE LINE FOR 1940 IS FORMING definitely on the right—Dewey, Vandenberg, Taft, Willkie, McNutt, and now Garner. Mr. Garner announced last week-end, with the modesty becoming a Texas Coolidge, that he would accept the nomination for President. At the same time he said he would "make no effort to control any delegates. The people should decide." This is good homespun talk which will not of course keep Mr. Garner from trying to control as many delegates as possible to the end that the people should decide on a conservative Democrat, preferably from Texas, with the "common sense" to dismantle the New Deal.

*

"DIRTY BUSINESS" WAS JUSTICE HOLMES'S term for wire-tapping by prosecuting agencies. Two new decisions by the Supreme Court make it harder than ever for the government to indulge in this kind of lawlessness. Both decisions, one by Frankfurter, the other by Roberts, forbid even the indirect use of evidence obtained by wire-tapping. The case involved in the first decision has an interesting history. In 1937 the Supreme Court, speaking through Justice Roberts, ordered a new trial for a group of alleged Puget Sound liquor smugglers on the ground that evidence obtained from tapped wires had been used for conviction. The same men appealed to the courts again on the ground that in the new trial conviction was obtained by the indirect use of evidence secured by wire-tapping. Justice Frankfurter, for the court, ordered a new trial in which the government must prove that the evidence in question was obtained independently. To permit indirect use of evidence illegally obtained, Justice Frankfurter said, would be to "stultify" the law. Justice McReynolds, last of the "rugged individualists" on the court, dissented. He was of the majority in the five-to-four decision in 1928 which permitted wire-tapping. Justice McReynolds is probably better prepared than we are to explain how one can be ruggedly opposed to government intervention in sweatshops but complaisant about government invasion of the privacy of telephone and telegraph wires.

*

THURMAN ARNOLD AND MAYOR LAGUARDIA should be interested in the Supreme Court's order affirming the decision of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals in the Zirkin case. An A. F. of L. union obtained an injunction forbidding a C. I. O. union to picket a concern with which the former had a contract. But the higher courts agreed in voiding the injunction on the ground that a jurisdictional strike is a "labor dispute" within the meaning of the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act. Mayor LaGuardia has denied that such strikes are protected by the act he sponsored. The language of the act, quoted in last week's *Nation,* seemed clear enough to the Supreme Court, as it does to us. The decision should also give pause to Thurman Arnold, for in his Indianapolis letter he included jurisdictional strikes among the labor-union practices which have "no reasonable connections" with the legitimate objectives of labor unions. He proposes to use the anti-trust laws against these practices. But according to this new decision he cannot obtain injunctions under the anti-trust laws against jurisdictional strikes, and the court's reasoning will make it more difficult to use the anti-trust laws in any form against them. Finally there is a moral here for the A. F. of L. How can it consistently fight the menace of the labor injunction and at the same time try to use that weapon against the C. I. O.? Had the A. F. of L. succeeded in the Zirkin case, the precedent would have been a boomerang.

*

IN RELEASING J. B. MATTHEWS'S "EXPOSÉ" of the consumer movement, Martin Dies enabled his pet investigator to fight a private feud on public time. But that isn't the whole story of the disgraceful episode.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is increasing evidence that in their foray against honest and legitimate consumer groups Dies and Matthews are acting as "transmission belts" for William Randolph Hearst and a number of leading American advertising and commercial interests. Last August the Federal Trade Commission issued a thirteen-page complaint against Mr. Hearst's *Good Housekeeping*. The complaint charged that the *Good Housekeeping* "Institute," which places its seal of approval on advertisements appearing in the magazine, is something less than scientific. It enumerated a host of advertisements approved by the institute which were a blend of half-truths and whole lies. J. B. Matthews's report, issued while the FTC hearings were in progress, specifically cited the prosecution of *Good Housekeeping* as part of the "Communist" attempt to undermine the sacred institution of advertising and thereby wreck the profit system. The Hearst *Daily Mirror* boasted of its part in "helping Mr. Dies to uncover communism" in the consumer movement. All this is on the public record. Far more significant is the charge made over the air by Drew Pearson and confirmed in *Space and Time,* a news letter for advertising men, that on November 30 Richard Berlin, general manager of Hearst publications, George Sokolsky, F. J. Schlink, and representatives of two leading national advertisers, meeting privately, heard J. B. Matthews read his report on consumer organization. They greeted it enthusiastically, and Sokolsky outlined plans for promoting the drive. Participants in the session emphasized that advertising interests should bring pressure on "recalcitrant" sections of the press to insure sympathetic publicity for the "exposé." The subsequent press coverage of the report is now history. Who owns Martin Dies?

*

THE LA FOLLETTE COMMITTEE'S HEARINGS on California's migratory labor situation have been ignored in the press in a way that contrasts sharply with the space given the Dies and the NLRB hearings. Yet of the three the La Follette committee has produced the most substantial and most sensational testimony. It has been established that as a result of the activities of the Associated Farmers, there have been far more violence and more extensive infringement of civil liberties in California than in any other agricultural region in the country. This is of particular significance in view of the fact that the Associated Farmers voted at their recent convention to extend their organization throughout the country. An Associated Farmers of Minnesota has already been formed, and plans have been announced for organizing in twelve other states. In a 10,000-word statement Paul S. Taylor, professor of economics at the University of California, presented to the committee a masterly analysis of the agricultural-labor problem in California and other parts of the country. He demonstrated statistically that the problem was not one of the relationship between a typical farmer and his hired men. Recent years have seen the development of a group of "farm operators" who are not farmers in the traditional sense of the word. They are rather farm employers who have introduced large-scale production in agriculture at the expense of a submerged class of migratory workers. Although California has gone farther than any other state in this direction, there is abundant evidence that it is merely providing a preview of events that may soon rock the entire country.

*

EARL BROWDER'S ARREST ON CHARGES OF using a false passport now seems to have been the signal for launching a widespread attack aagainst the Communist Party rather than the isolated prosecution of an individual who happens also to be head of a political movement. Jack Stachel, Communist trade-union leader, is being sought as a passport-fraud witness; Nicholas Dozenberg, reputed to be one of the founders of the party, has been arrested on charges of conspiracy after a melodramatic cross-country chase; and Harry Gannes, foreign-affairs expert of the *Daily Worker,* has been indicted for using a false passport. The case against Stachel and Dozenberg is yet to be revealed, but that against Gannes is not impressive. He is accused of obtaining a passport fraudulently in 1938, the fraud consisting in the fact that his application failed to mention a passport he obtained in his own name in 1926 and one he obtained for China in 1932 under the name of Jacobs. The statute of limitations, of course, bars prosecution of the 1932 offense. In the case of Gannes as in that of Browder the failure to admit use of a false passport is being used to circumvent the statute of limitations. A more basic question is whether these prosecutions may not also become a means of circumscribing political liberty for Communists or those suspected of sympathy with them—possibly a very large number, as the Dies committee's generous use of the red label indicates.

*

A LONG REPORT ON LIVING, WORKING, AND health conditions in the mining area of Missouri, Oklahoma, and Kansas, recently published by the Tri-State Survey Committee, shows that one does not have to go to the Dust Bowl or the valleys of California to find men and women living on a "Grapes of Wrath" standard. Workers in the area are largely descendants of English and Scotch-Irish pioneers with roots deep in the country. The housing conditions of these Americans is incredibly bad. Out of 4,867 dwellings investigated, no fewer than 3,541 were classified as unfit for human habitation. Many are mere tar-paper shacks of two or three rooms. Inside plumbing and central heat are almost non-exist-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ent. Sanitary facilities are seriously deficient both in the homes and in the mines. As a result of such conditions, ill health is widespread. The most serious problem is the prevalence of tuberculosis, which originates as silicosis contracted in the lead and zinc mines. The tuberculosis death rate is about three times the national average. Although the mine operators have made commendable efforts to eliminate the silicosis hazard, the investigation shows that their efforts have been too narrow in scope. Public-health education and facilities are hopelessly inadequate. Several previous investigations in this area have disclosed the same appalling conditions. How long will action be confined to reports?

*

CHARGES MADE BY JOHN L. SPIVAK AGAINST Father Coughlin in a series of articles in the *New Masses* warrant thorough investigation by the Department of Justice. Spivak accuses Coughlin of diverting tax-exempt funds to political uses, of collecting money through the mail under false pretenses, and of filing false statements with the postal authorities about the circulation of his *Social Justice*. Documents purporting to support these charges have not only been incorporated in the articles but have been submitted to the Department of Justice. Thus far the department has made no response. But *Social Justice* itself has responded with a hysterical and inflammatory attack on the *New Masses* editors, carefully avoiding any discussion of the evidence. This may satisfy the Father's frenzied followers, but it should not satisfy the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which in the case of Communist leaders has displayed an irrepressible zeal. The Attorney General's silence is no tribute to the political integrity of his department.

Irony at Geneva

PROCEEDINGS at Geneva last week were steeped in the spirit of irony. The League of Nations, waked from a long sleep by the Russian invasion of Finland, took more rapid and decisive action against a breach of the Covenant than it had ever previously attempted. For the first time it exercised its power of expulsion and against a state whose representative had argued eloquently year after year for effective measures to halt aggression. Now these rhetorical grenades were picked up by countries which on former occasions, when League aid was invoked, had been content to stall and compromise, and flung back in Moscow's face.

For all that, the verdict of the League was a just one. Russia's aggression against Finland is as inexcusable as Italy's rape of Ethiopia; indeed, more inexcusable because of the ideals the Soviets once championed and still claim to represent. In one of its earliest proclamations, on November 7, 1917, the Soviet government asked for a just peace without annexations, which it defined as follows:

> By annexation or seizure of foreign territory the government . . . understands any incorporation of a small and weak nationality by a large and powerful state without a clear, definite, and voluntary expression of agreement and desire by the weak nationality, regardless of the time when such forcible incorporation took place. . . .
>
> If any nation whatsoever is detained by force within the boundaries of a certain state and . . . is not given the right to determine the form of its state life by free voting and completely free from the presence of troops of the annexing or stronger state and without the least pressure, then the adjoining of that nation by the stronger state is annexation.

Stalin cannot forget that he once subscribed to such a policy, and his consciousness of guilt is betrayed by his attempts to cover an imperialist adventure with such ragged shifts as the Terijoki "people's government."

Soviet hypocrisy does not make League hypocrisy any more palatable, and the self-righteousness of some nations at Geneva was nauseating. An active part in the condemnation of Russia was played by states which have not hitherto been conspicuously active in promoting League principles and in any case are far enough removed from Russia to make moral courage cheap. The pitiable nervousness of the small states neighboring either Russia or Germany was proof of the demoralization of Europe and the belatedness of the League's effort to take a stand for the rights of small nations. Between these two groups the representatives of Britain and France, the only two great powers remaining at Geneva, steered an uneasy course but finally agreed to support the resolution calling for expulsion. However, a curious procedure was adopted to safeguard the chins of those countries within Russian reach, and the report drafted by the Committee of Thirteen, with several members abstaining, was adopted in the Assembly, not by a roll-call vote, but by the failure of any delegate to rise in opposition.

The actual position as regards assistance to Finland is little altered by the League's action. The resolution made no call for sanctions against Russia but merely asked members, and non-members as well, to render what aid they could to the Finns. It will be interesting to see how much Argentina, Portugal, and other states which were especially vociferous in condemning Russia will do toward implementing this pledge of help.

Meanwhile, there are signs that the invasion of Finland may provide a cue for yet another peace offensive by Berlin. A Nazi plea to halt the war in order to stem the red tide would undoubtedly meet a response in varied quarters. In the Allied countries, and still more in the neutral states, there are men of property who would forgive Hitler everything if he turned his back on Stalin.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Italy, Spain, and the Catholic church are powerful forces working in the same direction. But to do the British and French governments justice, they have so far shown no sign of being diverted by the Communist bogy from their war against the Nazis. Their present attitude seems rather that there is little to choose between Hitlerism and Stalinism, but that the former offers the greater immediate danger. Both are nihilistic forces which can only stimulate each other's growth. For our part we can think of no step more fatal to the Western powers than to form an alliance with Germany against the Soviets. At one stroke it would revive fascist morale everywhere and give Hitler a safe passage to his goal—the mastery of Europe.

Investors Organize

SMALL investors are the cannon fodder of corporate finance. When big business intrenches to resist some alleged onslaught of government on the rights of private enterprise, the little men and the widows and orphans are sent into the front line. And when a corporation comes to grief owing to mismanagement or plain skulduggery, it is the same people, more often than not, who are left holding the bag. The big insiders all too frequently can take advantage of advance information to retire unscathed. In 1929, as is well known, leading New York banks urged customers to buy their stock at the very time the top officers were steadily unloading in anticipation of trouble.

The experiences of the past ten years have made small investors rather more cautious—which is as much a factor in the present sluggishness of Wall Street as the "hostility" of Washington—while, thanks to the Federal Securities Act and the activities of the SEC, highway robbery of stockholders has been made both harder and more dangerous. Nevertheless, the man with a few thousand dollars to invest outside the government bond market still finds the scales weighted against him. Corporations are now compelled to make greater disclosure of information, but it is not always readily available, especially to those living in the country, nor is it in a form easily digested by the financially inexpert.

For this reason we welcome the formation of the American Investors' Union, which intends to maintain a vigilant watch on developments in the investment, savings, and life-insurance fields. It will subject the accounts of corporations in which members are interested to critical analysis, examine merger and reorganization proposals, and give advice on investment lists and insurance programs. It will also seek to enlarge the influence of small stockholders in corporate meetings and, when authorized, will act as proxy for members. Finally it will work to strengthen existing legislation designed to safeguard investors and will organize opposition to laws which threaten to diminish their rights. The union has an impressive list of sponsors and includes on its board of directors John T. Flynn, well-known financial writer; Paul J. Kern, president of the New York City Civil Service Commission; Dr. Robert Lynd, coauthor of "Middletown"; Councilman Robert K. Straus of New York City; Professor Colston E. Warne, president of Consumers' Union; and Professor Robert A. Brady of the University of California. Bernard J. Reis, author of "False Security: the Betrayal of the American Investor" and a leading accountant, is to be the executive director.

Worthy of Dies

THE daily press, never strongly prejudiced in favor of labor, has been making the most of the Smith investigation of the NLRB. First prize for distortion goes to Roy W. Howard's ex-liberal New York *World-Telegram*, which ran an eight-column line, "Shoot Rivals, C. I. O. Union Told. House Told Labor Board Knew of Order. Would Kill A. F. L. Miners 'Faster Than Rabbits.'" The story, as might have been guessed, was slightly exaggerated. The headline grew out of a memorandum written by one man on what another man said a third man had said. A day later, but too late to erase the impression made by story and heads, the man who was supposed to have said it denied it. But the newspapers are not as much at fault as the committee, which is conducting its investigation in slaphappy fashion, skittering from one obscure memorandum and its sweeping charges to another, without finishing any topic or giving persons slandered or accused a fair opportunity to be heard in reply. These investigators are not only anti-labor; they are also incompetent. The reader soon finds himself lost in a maze of memoranda that no one could understand without a great deal of background, and the background is never supplied. A request by Charles Fahy, counsel for the NLRB, for permission to examine or cross-examine witnesses was denied. Permission to introduce evidence in rebuttal after damaging memoranda had been read was "neither granted nor denied." Arthur Krock set a new high in fatuity when he wrote of these requests that "in refusing to permit the board's counsel to control the order of the proceeding Mr. Smith appeared to be setting a high standard of inquiry at the beginning." One could as justly say that the request of accused persons for defense counsel was an attempt to control the order of court proceedings.

An interesting "first thought" appeared in Turner Catledge's story of the Smith investigation in last Sunday's New York *Times*. "There was some oddity, on first thought," Catledge wrote, "in the revelation that board members left memoranda in their files criticizing or condemning the conduct of important officials of the agency." The memoranda referred to were principally

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those of the board's newest member and the committee's star witness, William M. Leiserson. After July 20, when the resolution authorizing the investigation was passed, Dr. Leiserson should have realized that every word he wrote would be subpoenaed by a hostile committee.

At the hearing, though both the chairman and the counsel were obviously uninterested in what he had to say, Dr. Leiserson did manage to read into the record some sections of a carefully written defense of the act and of the board which contrasted strangely with his intra-office notes. This part of his testimony was either buried or omitted in the reports in most newspapers. One sentence, coming as it does from the committee's principal eyewitness of the board's alleged wickedness, should have a deflating effect on the "revelations" to which the committee has treated an eager press. "I must say," Dr. Leiserson declared, "that on the whole the other members of the board are to be commended for the good job they have done under very trying circumstances." A companion sentence throws a not too flattering light on Dr. Leiserson's judgment in putting in the way of such a committee vague memoranda airing his differences with the other members of the board. "I think a great injustice has been done to a devoted body of public servants," Dr. Leiserson said, "by the manner in which blanket charges of partisanship and misbehavior have been directed at employees and agents of the board." So do we.

We have no doubt that the NLRB has made its mistakes, but we are not prepared to condemn it on the basis of ex parte proceedings, particularly when the charges made are vague and suspiciously unsupported by concrete evidence. We withhold comment on the complaint of Elinore M. Herrick, New York regional director, about "un-American" methods in the investigation of her office by the board until both sides have been heard—in the American way. We are not even disposed to pass judgment in the case of Dr. Leiserson's charges against Nathan Witt, secretary of the NLRB. Witt's past record and Dr. Leiserson's admission that he based the charge of partiality against Witt "merely upon impression" lead us to conclude that Dr. Leiserson may be too impressionable. If anyone is guilty of lacking impartiality, it is the committee's counsel. According to *Labor,* organ of the railroad brotherhoods, Toland has been the Washington representative of Earl F. Reed, a Pittsburgh corporation lawyer and head of the committee of fifty-eight American Liberty League lawyers which solemnly assured the country that the Wagner Act was unconstitutional. Toland's effort to drag in the red bogy in questioning an official of the International Juridical Association threatens to involve the committee in a jurisdictional dispute with the Dies committee. His fantastic attempt at one point to make it appear that the Labor Board might accuse parish priests of unfair labor practices is worthy of Dies.

Heywood Broun

"SOME years ago," wrote Heywood Broun back in 1927, "I discovered that it was easier to write about myself than any other subject." He could hardly have picked a richer mine to work. For Broun never wrote of himself neurotically or as one who merited attention for his own sake; he wrote lustily of himself as the incidental center of a whole succession of lively environments. There was Broun the Poker Player and Bon Vivant, Broun the Father, Broun the Crusader, Broun the Musical Comedy Actor, Broun the Socialist, Broun the Amateur Painter, Broun the Militant Trade Unionist, Broun the Communist Sympathizer, Broun the Dog Fancier, Broun the Religionist. Always the activity, the way of life, was the important thing, even though it emerged purely and unblushingly in the form of the impact it made on the mind of Heywood Broun.

It is hard to escape the feeling that Broun's choice of mediums dictated the course of his life, converting it from a genial shiftlessness to a stubborn, if easy-going, quest of a holy grail. Broun started out with more than the usual complement of honesty, a genuine feeling of good-fellowship, and a vast capacity to be impressed. Having to set down his thoughts from day to day, he found himself in time driven into positions which he would not have approached in cold theory. These stands on particular issues he defended with skill and passion, and as he did so the logic of events moved him to an acceptance of more general positions. Unburdened by any theoretical frames of reference, he gave himself unsparingly and with great gusto in single engagements, but often found himself unable to go along with the same comrades-in-arms in subsequent campaigns. From a passionate adherence to a Voltairean liberalism he passed through the fires of the Sacco-Vanzetti case to the conclusion that "there is no reason to respect the man who keeps his mind so open after the storm has broken that he cannot temper the wind to any shorn lamb." He ran for Congress as a Socialist, only to abandon the party shortly afterward in a leftward drift that went on unchecked until the Russian-German pact turned him in hot indignation against the Communists.

His intense honesty and what he called his "extraordinary mixture of sophistication and naivete" proved tragic for Heywood Broun, driving him always in search of a haven, and leaving frequent scars where he found himself forced to turn against old friends. But if his odyssey was tragic for him, it was a boon to the causes he espoused, for everything Broun championed was the stronger for his adherence. His passion and eloquence in behalf of Sacco and Vanzetti were the equal of Zola's "J'accuse"; the American Newspaper Guild is a monument to his tireless efforts for labor; and *The Nation* is certainly the richer for his contributions to its pages.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Great Debate

BY FREDA KIRCHWEY

IN THIS issue of *The Nation* four contributors discuss the future of Europe. All of them are persons of long experience in the jungles of European relations. This does not mean that they follow identical tracks or come out at the same place. Each has his particular angle of approach and emerges with a theory of his own. But at this stage in the war difference is more valuable than unanimity. What we need today is not cut-and-dried specifications for a new and orderly Europe. We need, rather, to accumulate and examine data, compare notes, exchange ideas, and slowly crystallize conclusions that stand a chance of representing a consensus of free opinion when the war ends.

The discussions in *The Nation* this week are the first of many that will appear in the months to come. We hope to present contributions by Europeans now in exile, whose opinions must carry particular weight; by representatives of the smaller European neutrals, whose stake in both war and peace is almost as great as that of the belligerents; and by Americans who understand the significance of our role as a great power in a contracting world. In the course of this debate *The Nation* will work out its own editorial position. A new world order cannot be built in a day—even on paper.

A good many good people are cynical about the whole subject. They recall the results of similar well-meaning discussions in the last war. Then, as now, liberals, pacifists, laborites, Socialists talked into existence the idea of a great European union to be formed when the fighting ended. Popular support for the war was largely founded in the ideas of such groups. At Versailles they —and Europe—were betrayed. Today many persons in similar groups, like burned children, shun the peace plans being generated by the present struggle. They are wary of enthusiasms and commitments that may be used for contrary ends by those who make policy. Such a state of mind is natural, but it is self-defeating too. The hope of the world lies in a constructive and generous peace; and men and women with enough disinterested wisdom to help frame or promote it cannot claim exemption because they fear betrayal. They can only add vigilance to their efforts and try to back them up with power as well as good intentions.

This is just as true in America as it is in Europe. The sort of settlement reached after the war will determine the course of American trade, the size of our navy, our relations with every country in the world, and in the end our political and economic institutions here at home. The war in Europe may not be "our war," but the peace will be our peace even if we neither fight for it nor help negotiate it.

Whatever their differences, the contributors to this issue join in one major conclusion—the need of creating a federal union of European states at the end of the war. That this proposal implies a vast overturn of existing relationships and institutions, none of them denies. Military victory over Hitler is only the first and most obvious objective. Revolution in Germany—halted somehow this side of communist dictatorship; suppression of the violent nationalisms that have barricaded themselves behind insuperable tariff walls; the ousting of reactionary governments now in control on both sides of the struggle: these are a few basic prerequisites of a European peace based on union. Beyond them lies the demand for fundamental social change throughout an impoverished continent, change which will take from Hitler, and from Stalin as well, the power to rouse a population suffering under the growing ills of capitalism and, in many parts of Europe, under the remnants of a decayed feudalism. To face these staggering difficulties and consider how they are to be overcome is as important as the formulation of peace terms, and it is an inescapable part of the same job.

CONTENTS

THE SHAPE OF THINGS	693
EDITORIALS:	
IRONY AT GENEVA	696
INVESTORS ORGANIZE	697
WORTHY OF DIES	697
HEYWOOD BROUN	698
THE GREAT DEBATE by Freda Kirchwey	699
BRITISH LABOR'S DOUBLE WAR by G. D. H. Cole	700
THE MENACE OF A UNITED GERMANY by Robert Dell	702
UNITED STATES OF THE DANUBE by Rustem Vambery	705
G.O.P. BUDGETS FOR THE HUNGRY by Robert Jordan	708
EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS by Keith Hutchison	709
IN THE WIND	710
ISSUES AND MEN by Oswald Garrison Villard	711
BOOKS AND THE ARTS:	
NOTES BY THE WAY by Margaret Marshall	712
DANUBE MOSAIC by Franz Hoellering	713
SPANISH TESTAMENT by Leigh White	713
THE POETRY OF MARK VAN DOREN by John Peale Bishop	714
HANDBOOK FOR BOAT-OWNERS by Hugh H. Darby	716
DRAMA: CHRISTMAS SUGGESTIONS by Joseph Wood Krutch	716
RECORDS by B. H. Haggin	718

Editor and Publisher
FREDA KIRCHWEY

Managing Editor ROBERT BENDINER
Literary Editor MARGARET MARSHALL

Associate Editors
KEITH HUTCHISON MAXWELL S. STEWART I. F. STONE

Assistant Editor
JAMES WECHSLER

Dramatic Critic
JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Business Manager and Director of Circulation
HUGO VAN ARX

Advertising Manager
MURIEL GRAY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British Labor's Double War

BY G. D. H. COLE

London, December 4

I MAKE no pretense to be able to state the war aims of the Chamberlain government. I remain strongly opposed to that government, and convinced that its foreign policy in recent years has been a long sequence of disastrous blunders. I believe that if the British and French governments had stood solidly behind the policy of collective security from the moment that Nazi aggression first became a serious menace, either war could have been averted, or, if it had come, we could have been certain of confronting the aggressor with an overwhelming opposition. I am convinced that we ought to have stood firm in 1938, at the time of the Munich surrender, and that we could at that time have made sure of securing the help of the Soviet Union. I hold that, in default of that help, the unilateral pledge to Poland was a blunder, and that it has landed Great Britain and France in war under unfavorable conditions which a wiser policy could have avoided.

Nevertheless, now that Great Britain and France are at war with the Nazis I feel I must support the war, because there can be no real peace or security in Europe and no decency in international relations until the monstrous machine which the Nazis have built up for purposes of military and economic aggression has been put out of action. I believe I share that feeling with the vast majority of my fellow-citizens. Our first and foremost war aim is to check and to defeat a political gangsterism which has become an intolerable threat to all decent living, except for those who are far enough removed from it not yet to appreciate its menace.

Therefore, despite all my dislike and suspicion of the Chamberlain government, I support the war. But it does not follow that I, or those who think as I do, regard a military victory as our principal war objective. We want most, not a military victory which might lead to a second Versailles and a second Hitler—each worse than the first—but a German democratic revolution, which will create in Germany a government with which we can hope to make peace on fair and equal terms. Such a revolution, we are aware, cannot be made from outside Germany. It must be the work of the German people, disillusioned with the fruits of the predatory militarism by which they are now enthralled. But the revolution can be helped, though it cannot be made, from outside Germany; and it should be a principal objective of British policy to help it in every possible way.

The aim of Nazi propaganda is to represent Great Britain as fighting a war for British imperialism. But this is sheer perversion of the real facts. The opponents of the Chamberlain government are well aware of the danger that, under its auspices, imperialist motives are bound to count for much; for the British Conservatives have no intention of renouncing British control over the colonial empire if they can find means of keeping it. But that is a very different matter from fighting an imperialist war, and it would be impossible to rally the support of the British people behind a war fought mainly for imperialist ends. Nor are the opponents of imperialism in Great Britain at all minded to surrender the British Empire to Hitler, so that he may exploit it with much greater ruthlessness. We want to end empires, not to transfer them from one state to another.

It is not easy to combine the two tasks which at present face the democratic forces in Great Britain—to support the war, and to oppose the government so as to bring about a creative peace. Nor is it easy to state the terms of peace for which we stand, for these must depend in part on the development both of military operations and of conditions inside Germany—to say nothing of the unknown factor of Soviet Russia. In order to state the aims of British democracy, I have to make assumptions; and I shall assume at this point the fall of Hitler and the possibility of then establishing in Germany a democratic regime.

On that assumption I want, and I think British democrats generally want, some sort of federal union of the states of Western Europe. I do not believe it is practicable to aim at a federation wide enough to include the United States or any of the other independent states of the American continent. Nor do I believe that it is practicable to include the Soviet Union, or the countries of the Far East. I hope, indeed, for some sort of league wide enough to draw all these states together for certain forms of common action; but for Europe—at any rate for Western Europe—I feel sure we must aim at a much closer union than is yet possible for the world as a whole.

Our aim, then, must be a federation of as much of Europe as can be brought to agree on a basis involving a complete pooling of all armed forces other than police, a creation of a network of common services, especially in the field of transport, directly controlled by the federation, a common Parliament democratically elected by the citizens of the constituent states (and therewith, I hold personally, a common elected executive authority with powers and functions not unlike those of the President

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the United States). Over the whole area of the federation there must be a great effort to develop economic collaboration and a common public opinion based on free movement and intercourse between the peoples; and, on the other hand, there must be for each national group and for each important minority the fullest freedom to retain and develop its own culture and its own institutions of local and regional government.

I am convinced that no federation of this sort can be workable as long as any state included in it retains a separate colonial empire of its own. Accordingly, I believe that federation involves a complete pooling of all colonial empires, under the direct authority of the federation as a whole. As for the British dominions and India, I believe that they should be given the right to enter the federation as equal partners, if they so desire.

This is, of course, the merest outline, needing to be filled in at many points. But I have no space to develop it further here, save in one aspect. I am sure federation cannot work unless the states composing it possess compatible political and economic institutions, and are all, in a broad sense, animated by a common idea. The only idea capable of uniting Western Europe into such a federation as I suggest is the idea of democracy, economic as well as political, growing out of the half-democracy which has developed gradually in most of them in the course of the past hundred years. Federation is impossible between, say, democratic Sweden or Switzerland and militarist Germany or Italy. It is not possible without revolutions in those countries, or without large advances toward democracy in the greater capitalist states, such as Great Britain.

British democrats must aim at overthrowing the Nazi tyranny, because there is no hope of European federation while it lasts. But they have also to wage a struggle on the home front for British democracy, and to do all they can by close common action with French democrats to further the advance of democracy in France. They have to do this in order to create a public opinion which will insist, when the time comes, on a democratic and constructive peace, and in the meantime will protest loudly and vigorously against any attempt to win the war for other than democratic ends.

So far I have been writing on the assumption—essential to a decent and creative peace—of revolution in Germany. But what if the German revolution fails to happen? I confess that without that assumption I find it exceedingly difficult to formulate war aims at all. For unless the Germans do revolt against Hitler before all Western Europe has been devastated and exhausted by prolonged warfare, it looks very much as if the making of the peace will be a matter neither for Mr. Chamberlain nor for British democracy nor for Hitler nor for the German people, but for Stalin; and I do not pretend even to guess what sort of peace Stalin would be likely to dictate to an exhausted Europe. As a Socialist I profoundly admire many of the achievements of the Soviet Union; but in common with the vast majority of my fellow-Socialists I do not believe that the institutions which have been built up in barbaric Russia are suitable, without great modification, for being transplanted to the more civilized countries of the West. In Western Europe we have established, under a capitalist system which has been rapidly becoming obsolete, certain habits and institutions which are of permanent value; and it would be a disaster to humanity if these habits and institutions were now to be uprooted and destroyed. High among them I rank the value set on individual liberty and the toleration, within fairly broad limits, of differences of opinion and behavior, the freedom, still within limits, of speech and writing, and the freedom to assemble and organize voluntarily for a host of purposes and causes of every sort and kind.

One of our chief war aims is the preservation of these values as a foundation on which to build the democratic society of the future. The Nazis have trampled on them deliberately, as inconsistent with the totalitarian ambitions of the military state. The Russians have never possessed them. We, who have known them and cherish them, are fighting that they may be preserved. For they are the human habits and institutions by which alone democracy can save itself from the menace of the leviathan state, armed as it is now with the formidable weapons of mass-production, not only of instruments of destruction, but of human opinion as well.

Our war aim, then, little as our rulers of today may love it, is democracy; and as Hitlerism is the principal enemy of democracy, in fighting Hitler they are urged forward to fight for democracy even against their will. That is why British Labor and British radicalism are supporting the war, despite their intense dislike and mistrust of the Chamberlain government. That, also, is why it is absurd to label the struggle an "imperialist war." For in fighting against Hitler's endeavor to turn the greater part of Europe into a German colonial empire of hewers and delvers for the Nazi Reich, the British government cannot but be driven, however little it wishes any such thing, toward the emancipation of its own subject peoples.

Western Europe must "federate or perish"; and it cannot federate until the tyranny of Nazism has been overthrown. Nor can it hope to federate, and work successfully its new collective institutions, except on a firm basis of democratic control. These objectives alone make sense of a struggle in which much else seems hopelessly confused. Finally, in struggling for these war aims of democracy, both against Hitler and in dealing with their own governments, European democrats need every ounce of help they can be given by the friends of democracy in the United States.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Menace of a United Germany

BY ROBERT DELL

NEVILLE CHAMBERLAIN said the other day that we must distinguish between war aims and peace aims. For once I agree with him. The aim of the present war is quite simple and purely negative. It is to put an end to German aggression and rescue its victims. No other way of doing that remained. Heaven knows that the British and French governments did their best—or worst—to avoid war by making concessions to Hitler in the hope of appeasing him; and it was this policy of appeasement that made war finally inevitable, as some of us foresaw that it would. We are at war now because we did not take the risk of war in time. Hitler could almost certainly have been stopped without war at any time up to last March—and even perhaps as late as last March—if the British and French governments had made it clear to him that if he did not stop they would fight. As *Pravda* said on August 14, ten days before the signature of the Soviet-German pact:

> The countries that are called democratic . . . yielded to the aggressors not because they are weaker—the bloc of capitalist democratic countries is stronger than the Fascists. What was the cause of the free hand that they gave to the aggressors? Comrade Stalin indicated the essential cause in his historic report to the eighteenth congress of the Bolshevik Party. He said: "The essential cause consists in the renunciation by most of the non-aggressive countries, England and France in particular, of the policy of collective security, the policy of collective resistance to the aggressors."

This is not an imperialist war on the part of the Allies. One of the paradoxes of the situation has been that a British government mainly composed of members of the party that claimed a monopoly of imperialism has done more to damage the British Empire and ruin its prestige than any previous government in history. Whatever the result of the present war may be, I doubt whether the harm done to the British Empire can ever be repaired.

Nor is this a capitalist war. Finance and big business in England and France have been for some time past ultra-pacifist. They have advocated peace at any price—even at the price of sacrificing vital British interests and allowing Hitler to dominate the greater part of the European continent—because, as Philip La Follette said in his speech to the Economic Club of New York last spring, they put their class interests, or what they believe to be their class interests, before those of their countries. They have feared that war might lead to social change, as it possibly will, especially in England. They have called social change "bolshevism" or "communism," to hoodwink the people. One thing that attracted them to Hitler was his destruction of organized labor. Now that Stalin has sacrificed communism to Russian imperial interests and thrown the whole European labor movement into confusion, the British ruling classes are disposed to be lenient toward Russia.

This is a people's war. The British pro-Nazis were obliged to change their policy, much against their will, by the pressure of public opinion. Last March the British and French people awoke to the fact that they had been duped by the promise of "peace for our time," and they determined to put an end to concessions to Hitler. In his speech in the House of Commons on March 15, after Hitler's entry into Prague, Chamberlain declared that what had happened could not make him change his policy. Three or four days later he had to eat his words. He was faced with the choice of changing his policy or resigning, and he chose the former. Had not his vanity been stronger than his concern for the welfare of his country he would have resigned after the catastrophic failure of his policy had been demonstrated. I am not surprised that his continued presence at the head of the government causes England to be distrusted in America and elsewhere, but he cannot turn back now. He is no longer master of the situation. There is no enthusiasm for the war in England and France, but there is a firm determination to carry it through to victory.

I am convinced that the British and French peoples will tolerate no peace negotiations with Germany until Germany has been beaten and reduced to impotence. They are unlikely to be taken in by the talk of communism in Germany, which no doubt has its source in Nazi propaganda. Communism is unlikely in Germany, and in any case it could be no worse than the Nazi regime. Hitler undoubtedly wants peace—on his own terms. He was forced into war because, confident that England would never fight, he had gone too far to draw back. But these are reasons why the Allies should go on with the war. All intelligent people in England and France know that Göring or the Reichswehr would be no improvement on Hitler. Hitler's aggressive foreign policy is not new. It is the continuation and logical development of the policy of imperial Germany before 1914, one of the bases of which was the *Drang nach Osten*.

No peace aims are necessary to justify the war, but we ought to consider what we are going to do if the Allies are victorious. If they are not, the Allies will have no voice in the matter and will no doubt have to submit to a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peace treaty even more oppressive than the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, compared to which the peace treaties of 1919 were extremely lenient, although too many people seem to have forgotten that fact.

For my part I believe that European federation—the creation of the United States of Europe—is the only solution, but I am not blind to the immense difficulties in the way of it, and we had better first consider what should be done in any case. The fundamental error of the peace treaties of 1919 was that they broke up Austria-Hungary and left Germany intact except for a certain diminution of territory, whereas they should have done exactly the contrary. The history of the last twenty years has indeed justified the dictum that if Austria did not exist, it would have to be invented. We must now reverse the process of 1919 by restoring Austria and breaking up Germany. I do not mean that we should restore the empire of the Hapsburgs. What is needed is a Danubian Federation.

The problem of Germany is quite other. We must recognize that we have to do with an abnormal country. An eminent diplomatist said to me in Berlin in 1933: "This is not a normal civilized country, and the German government is not a normal civilized government and cannot be dealt with as if it were one." This is the truth, and the removal of Hitler would not change it. It his book "Unto Caesar" F. A. Voigt says: "Only the shallowest understanding will see in the National Socialist revolution 'the result of Versailles.' That revolution is the nightmare of German genius come true. In the history of the Third Realm Versailles is but an incident and the Great War but an episode." He is undoubtedly right. The success of the Nazi movement was due fundamentally to something in the German subconsciousness. It was foretold more than a century ago by great Germans who knew nothing about the Treaty of Versailles. Mr. Voigt quotes a prophecy of Hölderlin's that the German people would be "made barbarous by industry and science and even by religion." Hitlerism is essentially a religion, and Hitler is primarily a religious leader. Göring said in an article published in the now defunct London *Morning Post* on January 31, 1934, that as Catholics believe the Pope to be infallible in matters of faith and morals, so the Nazis believe Hitler to be infallible in all matters concerning the moral and social interests of the people.

Heine foretold the Nazi movement in a remarkable passage in which he even foresaw the pagan revival in Germany. "The old gods," he said, "will shake the dust off their statues and descend from their pedestals." Goethe and Schiller said in the "Xenien" that the revolutionary class in Germany was the middle class. They were justified 140 years later by the Nazi revolution, which was, to begin with, essentially a middle-class movement. Much later, after the war of 1870, which he regarded as a defeat for German civilization, Nietzsche foretold the appearance on the German scene of a man such as Hitler, in whom, he said, "degeneracy determines an excess of spiritual and nervous electrical discharge." Such a man, he said, inspired fear, for "the fanatic, the man possessed, the religious epileptic, all eccentrics, have been regarded as the highest types of power, as divine."

In an interview with H. R. Knickerbocker published not long before I left Europe, Dr. Carl G. Jung said that Hitler belongs in the category of magician-chiefs to whom their followers attribute supernatural powers. "Hitler," Dr. Jung said, "is the mirror of the subconsciousness of every German, a loud-speaker who magnifies the imperceptible murmurs of the German soul." Vernon Bartlett expressed the same thing in different words when he said: "Mussolini rules Italy; Hitler is Germany." That is still true even if there is a certain amount of discontent in Germany at the present moment. If we distinguish between Hitler and the German people we shall make a disastrous mistake despite the sizable minority of determined anti-Nazis who have undergone ruthless persecution for their beliefs. When I returned to Germany in 1933 I was struck by the fact that many people whom I had known as sincere republicans and democrats had become equally sincere Nazis. In reality, they had been subconsciously Nazi all the time.

"LOOK OUT, BRAUCHITSCH, HE'S GETTING ANOTHER INSPIRATION!"

The success of the Nazi movement was due to several causes, one of which was the world economic crisis, but its chief immediate cause was the concessions made by England and France to Germany. In an article published in the *Temps* in 1929 Dr. Wilhelm Förster, the well-known German pacifist,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

said that it would be a mistake to evacuate the Rhineland, for its evacuation would lead to a great militarist and nationalist revival in Germany. I criticized him at the time, but I discovered later that he was right. He knew his fellow-countrymen better than I did. Hitler never counted as a force in German politics until 1930, after the evacuation of the Rhineland. At the German general election of 1928, nine years after the signature of the Treaty of Versailles and five years after the occupation of the Ruhr, there was not enough resentment left in Germany at those events to give Hitler more than 800,000 votes in the whole country. At the general election in September, 1930, after the evacuation of the Rhineland, he polled between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 votes. In March, 1933, he made himself absolute master of Germany in a few days, without any opposition, although Germany had the strongest trade-union organization in the world and the Socialist and Communist parties were very large and powerful.

If Goethe, Schiller, Hölderlin, Heine, Nietzsche, and other great Germans were able to make prophecies that have been fulfilled, it can have been only because they recognized certain faults in the German character. Every nation has certain peculiar characteristics which, although they are not shared by every individual, are so prevalent that they may rightly be called national, and which show themselves particularly in collective action or inaction. They are due not to race but to national history, environment, climate, upbringing, institutions, and other causes. In Germany an important factor has been the bad influence of certain German philosophers, notably Hegel and Fichte. Among the chief German national characteristics are an inferiority complex, a craving for a Führer, and an abnormal lack of common sense, which means a lack of political sense. Bülow was right when he said: *"Wir sind ein unpolitisches Volk."* The unification of Germany in 1871 intensified the faults of the German character and converted Germany into a huge machine which crushed whatever independence there was and destroyed individual initiative. When the machine broke down in 1918, most Germans were helpless.

Moreover, unified Germany has been a menace to Europe ever since it existed, and in particular to France. For the fact that it is now a greater menace than ever the German Social Democrats have a heavy responsibility. As Mr. Voigt says in the book already quoted:

> They carried the work of Bismarck one stage further in circumstances far more difficult than Bismarck ever had to face. And it is this work which Hitler and the National Socialists are completing—and striving to expand—on foundations which would have been destroyed had it not been for the Social Democrats. Without the Social Democrats and their organized and highly disciplined following, the unity of the German Empire would have perished in 1918.

Mr. Voigt thinks that it was to the credit of the Social Democrats that they sacrificed socialism to German nationalism. I cannot agree with him. Had German unity perished in 1918, we should have been saved this war.

One thing is certain. The French will not, if they can help it, tolerate the menace of a united Germany on their frontier any longer. They have had to put up with it for nearly seventy years and they have had enough of it. If the Allies have the victory, the French will probably insist on the break-up of the German Empire into its constituent parts and on the reduction of Prussia to its original dimensions. They will certainly insist on what they asked for in 1919, namely, the separation of the Rhineland from Germany and its conversion into an autonomous and neutralized state with its bridgeheads garrisoned by the French army. I was opposed to the French demand in 1919, but experience has taught me that the French were right. They abandoned that demand in return for guaranties by England and the United States, which were not implemented. The French felt, quite rightly, that they had been badly let down, and they are determined not to be let down again. When the German sheep were split up into little flocks with inoffensive little Führers, they were harmless. When the sheep became united in a single flock with a single bellwether, they became *moutons enragés*. Germany is a pathological case and needs pathological treatment. I do not say that the German people will never change, but it will take a long time to bring them to sanity and civilization.

If there is no European federation, it will be necessary to put the German states for a time under some sort of tutelage. They should be treated as mental patients, not as criminals. The Treaty of Versailles was much too severe economically and too lenient politically. The new peace treaty will have to be severe politically but very lenient economically. There must be no indemnities, even if nicknamed "reparations," and everything must be done to foster the economic life of the German states. They should be forbidden to have a totalitarian regime but should be allowed to have either a monarchy or a republic as they prefer. The matter would be immensely simplified by a European federation of which all the German states would be members. In any case a European customs union is essential, for we cannot permit the German states to have a customs union of their own. We must get rid of all the tariff barriers that are ruining the economic life of Europe. A European federation would be particularly to the advantage of the small countries, for it would make the continued existence and autonomy of even the smallest country possible. Without federation, the very small European countries can hardly survive. It was inevitable that the Baltic states, for example, should fall under Russian or German domination. A European federation would make a Danubian federation unnecessary.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As I have said, the difficulties in the way of European federation are immense. The linguistic and other differences make it much more difficult to form a United States of Europe than it was to form the United States of America. But the difficulties are less great than would be those of Clarence Streit's proposed union of certain selected countries, widely separated from one another geographically. In spite of modern communications, it is both more easy and more natural to federate the countries of a particular continent. I am not in a position to propound a scheme for a European federation. It is a matter that needs long and careful study. I should suggest Paris as the federal capital, for Paris is already the intellectual capital of the world. Moreover, the European continent should be federated even if England holds aloof, as I hope would not be the case. Naturally, there would have to be a federal Parliament with a senate in which every country would have the same representation, or perhaps the big countries might be allowed four senators and the others two. There should be no armed forces except those of the federation. Complete disarmament is quite impossible at present and is likely to be so for a long time. No country in the federation should be allowed to have a totalitarian government, but here again some might have monarchies and others might choose republics. The colonies of all the European countries should be held by the federation and administered by international mandates until they become sufficiently developed to stand alone. The position of the British dominions, which are independent states, would naturally not be affected, and India should be given full dominion status. There is no reason why the British Commonwealth should not continue even if the dominions were outside the European federation, as they would probably have to be. Russia would, I regret to say, have to be excluded until it ceases to be a totalitarian state.

It is possible that federation would have to be imposed on some countries as it had to be in America. The doctrine of self-determination, which was an exaggerated form of nationalism, has been one of the causes of the present deplorable conditions in Europe. A million people cannot be allowed to override the general interest of Europe. I do not know whether the governments of England and France would agree to the abolition of absolute national sovereignty which federation involves, or whether it would be possible to achieve federation immediately after the end of the war. It would certainly not be possible if Germany were victorious. There are, however, encouraging signs of a growing belief in the necessity of federation in every European country. It is possible that we may have to proceed by stages. At least, as I have said, we must make a European customs union, or Europe will perish. A federation of Europe does not involve the suppression of the League of Nations. On the contrary it would strengthen the League. If the example of Europe were ultimately followed by other continents we might in time attain Tennyson's ideal of "the parliament of man, the federation of the world."

United States of the Danube

BY RUSTEM VAMBERY

WARS are not courts of law, and peace treaties are not instruments of justice. Only the Princess on the Moon in Cyrano de Bergerac's "Histoire Comique" could ask her visitor from the Earth: "If people really believe justice is on their side in the war why do they not apply for arbitration instead?" True, Lord Bacon called war the test of justice, of which God is the judge, but since Frederick the Great discovered that the Almighty is on the side of the heaviest battalions, not even people living on the Moon would indorse Lord Bacon's view.

No such thing as justice is conceivable with the victor's gun leveled at the vanquished. There were never just and unjust treaties, merely reasonable and foolish ones. It is almost a truism to say that the Versailles treaties were preeminent specimens of the latter category. One of the many blunders—perhaps the greatest of all—of the elderly gentlemen who redrew the map of Europe was the way they carelessly and without forethought broke up the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

Not that this empire, created by Francis II under compulsion from the Rhenish Federation to indemnify the Hapsburgs for the loss of the Holy Roman Empire, was destined to long-continued existence. Though even the Czech historian Palacky declared—he was later to retract it—that if Austria did not exist it would have to be invented, the rising tide of nationalism was bound to sweep away this artificial structure. When after the Crimean War national states sprang up in Southeastern Europe like mushrooms after the rain, it became evident that the two "sick men" of Europe, the Ottoman Empire and the realm of the Hapsburgs, were going to disappear. The Allied Powers' secret agreement of 1915 only accelerated an inevitable process. Not even the plan which the murdered Crown Prince Franz Ferdinand had conceived to reorganize the empire by substituting trialism

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for dualism could have averted the disaster; such a system would not have satisfied the Czechs, the Slovaks, or the Rumanians, and it would have infuriated the Magyars.

It may be true that "he highest builds who with most art destroys," but the destructive work of the peace treaties was utterly lacking in art and revealed no comprehension of their economic and political bearings. The treaties broke up an economic unit in which Hungary was the granary and Austria the workshop; Austrian factories supplied to Hungary more than 70 per cent of its industrial needs. Each lost its best customer. Hungary also lost most of its timber and ore, while the Succession States received what they least needed. Rumania, abounding in timber and coal, got Hungary's woods and coal mines; Yugoslavia with its rich wheat fields was given Hungary's best wheat-growing regions; and Czechoslovakia, possessing in Bohemia and Moravia many well-developed industries, received its best factories.

Hence it seems that not even an economic excuse can be found for the creation of these various miniature reproductions of the conglomerate Hapsburg empire, with national minorities forming 41 per cent of the population in Czechoslovakia and 36 per cent in Rumania, and without the tradition that helped to maintain Austrian unity. Apologists for the peace treaties usually assert that post-war minorities in the Succession States totaled "only" 15,000,000 as against 26,000,000 in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. This is true, but at the same time a number of new national antagonisms, such as the Czech and the Slovak, the Polish and the Ukrainian, the Servian and the Croat, were created—antagonisms which either did not exist in the Hapsburg empire or were kept at bay by the central authorities. Moreover, minorities in post-war Europe, with the praiseworthy exception of Czechoslovakia, have been at the mercy of a chauvinism which the "victor" states developed out of their exultation and the vanquished ones out of utter despair.

Even if one admits that the old Hapsburg governess who in her Austro-Hungarian nursery was able to control these more or less infant peoples had to be dismissed, one is amazed that peoples of age like the English and the French could have hoped to secure peace by letting loose a half-dozen immature nationalities to build new customs barriers in Southeastern Europe. Scared to death by an imaginary Bolshevik danger, the Allies encouraged chauvinism in the defeated countries in the belief that fascism was a potent remedy against bolshevism. Allied generals took a delight in the display of rival militarisms in Central Europe, and British foreign policy, suspicious of the Little Entente as the outstretched arm of French hegemony on the Continent, backed reactionary efforts for a "peaceful revision." Statesmen in the victor countries simply ignored the fact that the East European mind is characterized by a childish boastfulness, a warlike spirit, a tendency to trickiness, and above all an utter dislike for truth, qualities imprinted on it by centuries of despotic Turkish and Hapsburg domination.

Hugh Dalton, when Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, said that the only practical policy is to take existing frontiers for granted and to aim not toward their revision but toward their obliteration. Unfortunately this was not practicable in 1919, partly because of the general European situation, partly because of the truth of what Shaw wrote in his preface to "John Bull's Other Island": "When you break a nation's nationality it will think of nothing else, listen to no philosopher, no preacher, until the demand of the nationalist is granted." Had the victors not played a hypocritical hide-and-seek game with nationalisms, had they, looking at the ethnographic map, realized that it is impossible to draw a sharp line between the hopelessly intermingled races and nationalities of Central and Southeastern Europe, had they, finally, paid attention, as they pretended to do, to the economic welfare of the peoples of whom they disposed with wanton recklessness, they would inevitably have reached the conclusion that a substitute for the Hapsburg empire must be created. It is true they had promised their "little allies" everything during the war, but with their economic and financial superiority they could easily have insisted that their satellites form a defensive economic unit against Germany. Apparently they had never heard of the allegory used by the Hungarian statesman Francis Deák, who spoke of the overcoat that was buttoned awry and that could not be adjusted without being first unbuttoned. They unbuttoned the realm of the Hapsburgs but failed to button it again. That is why Europe caught cold.

In this case it cannot be said that it is no use crying over spilt milk. For it is essential to the future of European civilization that the same mistake should not be repeated. Just now none but a fool or a humbug would venture to prophesy how the current war is going to finish. It is, in fact, not one war but three wars merged in one: a war of two empires against three would-be empires, another war between two ideologies screening the first, and a third very carefully hidden war between capitalism and its enemies. The partners and the adversaries are not the same in all three wars, but however the first two end Europe will have to face once more the problem of interspersed nationalities in the Southeast. And even the statesmen with whom Europe's fate rests may have learned from experience that kotowing before the abstract idea of sovereignty according to the prescription of the Covenant of the League is of as little value for preserving the peace as is dissimulating the dangers of nationalism. There is, of course, but one real solution, for which the example is set by the United States of America.

If the integration of smaller units is to precede the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States of Europe the victors must first consider the turmoil of peoples who live in the Danube basin. The idea of a Danubian Confederation is not a new one. After the defeat of the Hungarian struggle for independence in 1848-49, its leader, Louis Kossuth, in exile realized that the failure was mainly due to the hostility of the non-Magyar nationalities. Count Ladislas Teleki first suggested the federation of the Magyars, Slavs, and Rumanians, but Kossuth took up the idea. Any state of the lower Danube, he wrote, even if it were successful in "rallying round itself all its racial brethren now belonging to other states, could be at best only a state of second rank. However, if the Magyars, the South Slavs, and the Rumanians would adopt this plan, they would become a wealthy, powerful state of first rank, with 30,000,000 inhabitants, and would weigh heavily in the scales of Europe."

In Temperley's "History of the Peace Conference" we read: "Broadly speaking, the ethnic frontier between Hungarians and Rumanians was clear enough." As a result of this "clear" ethnic frontier 1,550,000 Magyars were handed over to Rumania. Professor A. J. Toynbee came perhaps nearer the truth when he wrote ("The Treaty of Versailles and After") that in dealing with the nationalities the top-dog of the pre-war regime had been "turned into under-dog and the pre-war under-dog [had] become the post-war top-dog." Any protection of minorities by legal rules has thus far proved illusory, and, further, the alleged violation of such rules has been used by the aggressor—this was the case in both Czechoslovakia and Poland—as an excuse for grabbing the coveted territory. In a cantonal federation the fair treatment of the minorities is guaranteed by the fact that the majority in one canton is a minority in another.

There is no doubt that only in a federal structure is there hope for autonomous cultural developments. Any other "revision" or readjustment of the frontiers in Southeastern Europe means but new irredentisms for old and suicidal economic autarchy. Before Munich the Magyars were to liberate their brethren under Czechoslovak domination; afterward, when Hungary had received a slice of the Nazi loot, the Slovaks wanted their brethren to shake off the Magyar yoke. In 1936 Dr. Hodza suggested the federation of Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Yugoslavia as the nucleus of an even more extensive union. Dr. Benes, in his book "Democracy—Here and Now," advocates a federated Danubian system, and he emphasized at Yale that what Europe needs is an entirely new principle of social and political organization.

No one could reasonably challenge the usefulness of a Danubian federation as a means of preventing German or Russian imperialism from swallowing the whole group of ambitious "sovereignties" in Southeastern Europe. Not one of these countries has been able to cope successfully with its own difficulties. In Czechoslovakia Slovak nationalism helped to dismember the republic; in Yugoslavia the Croats, of the same stock but different in religion and in their "Austrian" culture, are the stumbling-block to unity; in Rumania, in spite of agrarian reform, the Boyar rule persists. As for the surviving representatives of feudalism in Hungary, nothing short of restoration of the pre-war boundaries would satisfy their appetite for power and jobs.

In the light of these facts, can it be expected that the Danubian and Balkan "sovereignties," suffering more or less from an incurable megalomania, will voluntarily surrender the power and glory they crave for security and the peace of Europe? Like Chanticleer they all believe that their dunghill is the highest mountain range and that their crowing directs the rising of the sun. Their patriotism is not love of country, but love of *more* country. Without restriction of the sovereignty fetish a federation of Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and maybe Austria has little prospect of materializing. Not even the depressing outlook of becoming the sorry satellites of one of the rival imperialisms will drive them to do what a flock of sheep does in a thunderstorm. They will always hope to outwit one imperialism with the help of another. It will be the moral duty of the civilized victors, therefore, to squeeze those "sovereignties" into a federation which will be both a safeguard of peace in Europe and a guaranty of the economic prosperity of its members.

There is one premise, however, which the makers of a Danubian federation or an eastern Switzerland cannot ignore without sowing the seeds of future unrest and discord. A comparison of the statistics of the imports and exports of the Danubian countries, including Austria and Czechoslovakia, shows that a federation would undoubtedly be self-supporting. But this alone is not enough to remove the dragon's teeth of social upheaval. In most Danubian countries there is a strong undercurrent of discontent which may become manifest in either bolshevism or, if this is banned, a home-made Nazism. In order to satisfy an impoverished lower middle class and the jobless farm hands who are most susceptible to Nazi or Bolshevik contagion, it will be the victors' first business to clear away the remaining medieval and semi-Oriental economic institutions. This is the only way to take the wind out of the sails of the Nazi and Bolshevik corsairs. It is self-deception to deny that in all current dictatorships there really is a popular trend, at least with regard to their promises. And no democratic rule can be firmly established unless it reasonably fulfils the unreasonable promises made by the dictators. Without economic integration of the different nationalities of Southeastern Europe the next peace, too, will be but a temporary pause in the endless wars of rival powers on the European continent.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

G. O. P. Budgets for the Hungry

BY ROBERT JORDAN

Cleveland, December 14

OHIO is booming. Steel mills, automobile plants, machine foundries, textile factories—all are working at only a notch from capacity; Republic Steel of Cleveland has shot up to 97.2. Bank debits in Cleveland are $30,000,000 greater than in 1938; department-store sales have increased 25 per cent; and total income has risen $1,000,000. The number of unemployed has dropped by almost 100,000.

But Cleveland—or at least part of Cleveland—is hungry. From 70,000 to 80,000 people in this sixth largest city of America face the specter of starvation. In the month of November 60,000 had their relief cut one-third, low as had been the level previously maintained. Sixteen thousand were struck off the rolls altogether. Meanwhile, the politicians busy themselves, not with relief, but with the politics of relief. "No one is going to starve in Cleveland," declares Mayor Harold H. Burton. But reporters from other places find people living in virtual dog kennels on something less nutritious than dog food. The country hears about it. Cleveland itself hears about it—until now its press has been reticent. The President utters an indictment. Then Governor John W. Bricker amends the Mayor's statement: "There is no relief problem in Ohio." If people are starving in Cleveland, it is said outside, that is Cleveland's fault. "No," retorts Ohio's wealthiest city, "it's the state's concern." The state comes back: "It's Washington's responsibility." Washington replies: "Relief is a state problem." And so it goes, while thousands huddle quietly in their bare rooms, hang around chilly relief stations, or walk the streets despondently.

I met a fairly well-dressed elderly Jewish woman in a relief depot in a middle-class district, where, the supervisor assured me, they have the "highest type" of relief client. It was Thursday, and I heard this woman say: "I haven't got nothing to eat since Monday." At the same time an emaciated girl, twenty-five or twenty-six years old, was sobbing to a second relief worker: "I have no heat at all. I have babies. It's awful!" A moment later a burly Slavic laborer, in answer to the question "Who is feeding you?" replied, "Nobody. No money for two weeks." Rent orders are more difficult to get than food. Relief workers advise clients to jump the rent or cajole the landlord with tears.

To obtain an order for medication is almost an impossibility. A man who had earned $64 a week in 1932, now desperately ill with a spinal disease, was living when I saw him on two cups of coffee a day. The most the authorities would give him was an order for $1.15. A former piano-teacher who had anemia and suffered spells of dizziness when hungry received $1.40 for two weeks. Almost everyone I saw was ill with something—anemia, cardiac trouble, tuberculosis, arthritis, ulcers. At one stage city officials feared an outbreak of typhoid. Yet a person must be practically dying before he can get an order for drugs or medicines.

Cleveland has no relief standard. People fight for whatever they can get. The louder they holler the more they get, and vice versa. Up to October the city spent, officially, $27.70 per case per month. (About three persons comprise an average case.) New York City was spending $44, Rochester (New York) $48. But before the present crisis two 10 per cent cuts in relief had been made, bringing the average down to about $22.50. The latest 33⅓ per cent cut reduces the average further to about $15. Since the cost of living in Cleveland is higher than in all but three of the country's forty-one largest cities, persons on relief, especially when they have children, find themselves just above the absolute starvation level of those denied relief altogether. It is not strange that during the crisis the newspapers have reported a wave of petty crime, particularly purse-snatching and stealing in stores.

Early this month the federal government stepped in with forty carloads of supplies from the Surplus Commodities Corporation and 14,000 WPA jobs. The Cleveland press made it seem as if Santa had really come to town. But the joke was on the unemployed. The average surplus-commodities allotment was one basket of apples worth 20 cents, three pounds of flour worth 15 cents, three pounds of oatmeal worth 15 cents—a total of 50 cents' worth of food for a relief case for two weeks. Moreover, what can you do with flour when you have no yeast, milk, or eggs? The answer is that you mix it with water and walk about with a bloated stomach.

As for WPA jobs, I was informed by Federal Relations Commissioner Frank E. Bubna that only half go to persons on relief. Unemployed not on relief are being assigned the remainder because they more often reach the federal "standard of certification"; this qualification, not the emergency, determines WPA assignments in Cleveland. Moreover, all the new projects but one or two are outdoor projects, and Cleveland is noted for its heavy snows and subzero weather, while a goodly number of men who have been on relief are not as stalwart as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they might be. Commissioner Bubna informed me, further, that in the spring WPA will be cut again. If the 1939 curve is followed, the curtailment of WPA alone will bring on another sharp crisis. In fact, Cleveland is now carrying more relief cases than it did in 1935 solely because of a severe drop in WPA employment from 75,000 last January to 30,000 in August.

So much for federal assistance. The state has helped Cleveland even less. Governor Bricker, though a Republican like Mayor Burton, refused to provide any money during the emergency despite the fact that the state had been paying only a third of the dollar it promised to match against each dollar Cleveland supplied for relief. He charged extravagance. This appealed to the rural communities that dominate the Legislature through a 1910 gerrymander which gives the rich urban areas, containing 68 per cent of the population, only one-third of the seats in the Legislature. The rural majority some years ago passed a law prohibiting any municipality from levying special taxes for such purposes as relief. This law cannot be rescinded except by a 65 per cent vote; innumerable attempts by urban leaders to abolish it have met defeat. Thus Governor Bricker can be callous to the plight of Cleveland's and Toledo's jobless without decisively affecting his political strength in this state. The Governor, moreover, has Presidential aspirations and would like to point to Ohio's $8,000,000 surplus as the major reason why he should be nominated by the Republicans.

Mayor Burton fought Bricker in the crisis. LaGuardia and Roosevelt also attacked the Governor, lending tacit support to Burton. Burton has shown himself in the past to be more or less a New Dealer, but this does not make him a progressive. He campaigned for Bricker as the man who would solve the relief question. Furthermore, in the treasury of the city of Cleveland, just as in the treasury of the state of Ohio, there is more than enough money to care for the homeless and the hungry. But Burton too has aspirations—in the direction of the United States Senate—and he likewise wants to leave office with a balanced budget.

It is true Burton raised an emergency sum of $1,200,000 for relief against tax-delinquency bonds. But this is to cover only December relief, at the reduced level. The Mayor admits that the outlook for 1940 is black. The city's power of issuing deficiency bonds is now exhausted. Property-owners threaten revolt if they are taxed further. Relief next year, it is anticipated, will cost more than the $7,281,000 of 1939, especially if the unemployed organize, as they are now doing.

Three demonstrations before the City Council by Cleveland's three small unions of unemployed have already given officials the jitters. These were organized by the Federal Workers' Union, the Association of Unemployed, and the WPA and Professional Workers' Union, led, respectively, by Arthur Price, C. B. Cowan, and Louis Golden—all well known and highly respected among trade unionists and unemployed alike. The opinion of these three groups, now in the process of unifying, appears to be that Burton could raise relief standards by simply using part of the $14,000,000 sinking fund now lying fallow, and that by refusing to do so he is openly favoring the wealthy owners of city bonds.

Chronic unemployment has come to be taken for granted. What alarms officials in Cleveland, and in other cities, is the danger that with relief crises recurring in a period of industrial prosperity, the unemployed may get out of hand.

Everybody's Business

BY KEITH HUTCHISON

"Fifth Column" in the Treasury

THE guerrilla warfare waged against the New Deal by the big corporations and the surtax payers who control them goes on unceasingly. The victory won last summer, when the remains of the undistributed-profits tax went into the discard, produced no hint of appeasement from this grim army. On the contrary, it served to stiffen morale for a fresh campaign with the reduction of corporate-income tax and the abolition of the capital-gains tax as major objectives.

An important advantage possessed by the surtax generals is the presence of a "fifth column" in the Treasury itself headed by Under Secretary John W. Hanes, formerly a member of the Wall Street firm of Smith, Barney and Company. Back in August Mr. Hanes launched an appeal to the leaders of industry, banking, commerce, labor, and agriculture to send him ideas for improving the tax structure. All suggestions, he promised, would be carefully considered and laid before a special Ways and Means subcommittee of the House due to meet in November. The underlying intention of this plan, according to the Washington Bureau of the *Wall Street Journal,* was to organize support for further tax revision from the "business-aid" angle.

As one would expect, there was a warm response, and schemes rapidly piled up on Mr. Hanes's desk. That of the United States Chamber of Commerce may be taken as typical. It suggested no less than forty changes in the revenue laws, all designed to lessen the burden on the oppressed rich. Among its major proposals were the reduction of corporate-income tax by progressive stages to 15 per cent, reduction in individual surtaxes to a maximum of 40 per cent, "simplification" of the capital-gains-and-losses provision with the rate on capital gains reduced to 12½ per cent, and reduction in the estate duties. No suggestions were made as to how the loss of revenue involved in these changes would be met. The rather similar program of the Merchants' Association of New York included, however, a recommendation for the reduction of the present personal-income-tax exemption, coupled with an increase in the rate levied on the middle brackets.

This campaign for tax revision was getting along nicely

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

until November, when a change in atmosphere around the Treasury became apparent. About the time that the President at Warm Springs asked the public to consider whether the additional defense expenditure should be met by taxation or borrowing, both Mr. Morgenthau and Mr. Hanes stated that the Treasury had no program of tax revision in preparation. This apparent abandonment of earlier activities was explained when it became known that the White House was studying a new formula for an excess-profits tax. Advocates of tax relief, badly alarmed, decided that with such schemes in the air it would be better to avoid reopening the tax question. As the *Wall Street Journal* reported, "Those leaders who previously favored extensive tax revision in the interests of business stimulation are understood to feel that the imposition of 'war' taxation might well outweigh whatever benefits were offered by removal of further business irritants."

Checked in their major offensive, the tax warriors have been sniping at Section 102 of the internal-revenue code, to which new and more effective teeth were given by regulations issued last July. In 1938, when the battle against the undistributed-profits tax was at its height, one of the arguments of its opponents was that it was redundant, since Section 102, which originated in the Revenue Act of 1934, already gave the Treasury power to prevent surtax payers from eluding its grasp by piling up profits in corporate coffers. In an article in *Harper's Magazine* for February, 1938, Maurice Wertheim, the investment banker, said:

> Some well-informed lawyers and tax experts say that if a determined effort were made to enforce Section 102, even this could be done. Whatever the necessities of the case, let them be covered. No one can successfully defend the proposition that the only way to penalize unreasonably retained earnings is to penalize those reasonably retained.

Congress was impressed by this argument, and the Revenue Act of 1938, which emasculated the undistributed-profits tax, strengthened Section 102 by adding the following clause:

> (c) Evidence Determinative of Purpose.—The fact that the earnings or profits of a corporation are permitted to accumulate beyond the reasonable needs of the business shall be determinative of the purpose to avoid surtax upon shareholders unless the corporation by the clear preponderance of the evidence shall prove to the contrary.

The penalty where tax avoidance by such means is discovered amounts to 25 per cent on the first $100,000 of undistributed profits and 35 per cent on any excess.

Some criterion of unreasonable accumulation was still necessary, however, and this was provided by regulations issued on July 26, 1939. These brought under Section 102:

> (1) Corporations which have not distributed at least 70 per cent of their earnings as taxable dividends.
>
> (2) Corporations which have invested earnings in ways unrelated to their normal business.
>
> (3) Corporations which have made loans to officers or shareholders out of undistributed profits.
>
> (4) Corporations a majority of whose stock is held by a family or other small group of individuals.
>
> (5) Corporations the distribution of which, while exceeding 70 per cent of earnings, appear inadequate when considered in connection with the nature of the business or the financial position of the corporation.

Enforcement of Section 102 under these new regulations should be fairly effective in preventing tax avoidance through the accumulation of corporate surpluses. At the same time it need not affect growing businesses which are genuinely using profits in order to expand their plants. But surtax payers are less enthusiastic about the virtues of Section 102 now that it has served its purpose of helping to kill the undistributed-profits tax. They are complaining bitterly to Washington of the unfairness of the new instructions and especially of the rule that corporations which fail to distribute a sufficient proportion of their profits must prove that accumulation is to their "fifth column" for a way out. But the reinforced section has powerful friends, and so far even Mr. Hanes has not been able to get the offending regulations redrafted.

In the Wind

SOCIETY NEWS: On the New York *Times* society page last week appeared the picture of the daughter of a prominent New York family. The story below announced that she had been married in London to Gustavo Duran of Madrid. In society-page style the item said that Mr. Duran had been educated in Madrid and Paris, composed a ballet when he was twenty-one, and so on. One fact was omitted: Gustavo Duran was an officer in the army of the Spanish republic.

WASHINGTON NOTES: New Dealers are grumbling that Herbert Hoover has sewed up the Finnish delegation for the Republican convention . . . and rejoicing at Secretary Ickes's comment on Tom Dewey's opening speech: "Dewey has thrown his diaper into the ring."

WHEN MAX LERNER'S "It Is Later Than You Think" appeared last year, William MacDonald reviewed it for the New York *Times*. Two weeks after submitting his review, Mr. MacDonald died. Lerner's latest book, "Ideas Are Weapons," appeared last month, and Ernest Sutherland Bates reviewed it for the New York *Herald Tribune*. Two weeks after he turned in his copy, Mr. Bates died.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION: The St. Louis division of the Communist Party recently published a brochure defending the Russian invasion of Finland. One sentence read: "The Soviet Red Army cannot be an imperialist army. It can only serve as an army of liberation." The word "liberation" had been stamped on the page as a correction; originally it had been "liberalism."

THE VERTICAL file-service catalogue published by the H. W. Wilson Company lists current pamphlet literature. In its December issue this cryptic entry appears: "How the Army Trains Butchers, by Arnold Kruckman. 2 pages illustrated. Published by science research associates. Describes instruction courses for butchers in army schools."

THE NEW YORK *Daily News* recently published a photograph of Fritz Kuhn being led away to prison. It was captioned: *"Drang Nach Ossining."*

[Readers are invited to submit material for In the Wind. A prize of $5 will be awarded each month for the best item.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Issues and Men

BY OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

Collective Security Must Come

London, December 1

ONE of the few encouraging facts about the war situation is that here in England one finds universal recognition of the fact that if the Allies win there must be a new order and collective security in Europe if the Continent's civilization is to survive. The man in the street or perhaps one sitting next to you on the bus tells you that Europe cannot stand a continuance of the armed peace of the last five years. Only yesterday I was astounded to have an American army officer say to me that collective security must and will come because "the soldier has become too costly for any country to support." I had never expected to hear those words from an active officer of our army, but he assures me that he has been preaching the doctrine of collective security for some years. Reams and reams of white paper are being covered here by people writing on peace terms and on how Europe should be rebuilt if it survives this war. And there seems to be a pretty general recognition that if the nations will not or cannot outlaw war, they must find a collective way of guaranteeing peace. Preparedness for such wars as this one costs more than any nation can afford.

Ever since my return from Germany I have been eagerly asked what the surviving liberal, anti-Hitler forces there are thinking about the future. I have had to reply that I never heard the subject of a reorganization of Europe mentioned. The people of this stripe I talked with were all too much absorbed in the war and their actual living conditions to have time to think about what might come after. As for France, I hear that the one idea there—and my information comes from very important sources—is to deal with Germany, if the Allies win, in such a way that France will never again be invaded from the east. That is the collective security that they want. They are saying that this is the third attack since 1870 and that if they win, it will be the last. This time they are going to be thorough about it. They will take the left bank of the Rhine, will favor splitting Germany up into at least two states, one Protestant and one Catholic, and see that this time Germany's disarmament is permanent. This, by the way, is in accord with what one German I had just met said to me abruptly as we were parting: "The only way to deal with us Germans is to disarm us. Give us guns and we shall always be a menace because we like to be soldiers and to fight." Plainly, it will be extremely difficult to hold the French in line for anything else than a peace which they trust will make forever impossible the domination of Europe by German armies. They have learned nothing and forgotten much!

Here there continues to be a great deal of favorable discussion of Clarence Streit's plan for the federalization of Europe. It is admitted that the League of Nations is dead save for its Labor Office and its humanitarian activities. So the solution is rightly sought in a new machinery which will avoid the errors of the League, foredoomed to failure as it was by being tied up to that body of death, the Treaty of Versailles. The merit of Mr. Streit's proposal is in its suggestion for a federal union in which all nations would have equal status; its weaknesses and faults are many—he does not even define democracy before using the word as a touchstone in picking out the states which he would have lead the way to a federal union of the world. But he must be given credit for having made people everywhere think about a new world order.

The difficulties in the way of collective security are endless, as the French attitude shows. The other day when I was urging one more restatement of the Allied peace aims for the purpose of encouraging the peace movement within Germany a British officer said to me, "But there are great difficulties in doing that." I replied, "I am aware of them all and probably know more about it than you do since I have just been on the other side of the fence in Germany. But is it not the task and duty of your statesmen to find the way out? Who else will, just now?" He admitted that I was right. What frightens one over here is the conviction that it will be harder to get a wise and just peace than in 1919 because there were no such madmen as Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini to deal with then, and no such hostile economic systems to reconcile. But what is even more alarming is the dearth of statesmen equal to the tasks which will confront the peace-makers if the Allies win. One almost regrets that there is no one with the forcefulness of Clemenceau or the adroitness of Lloyd George as one scans the horizon for anybody who gives promise of having the stature needed for the superhuman job ahead. But then the realization comes again that for all their ability these leaders of 1914 were the architects of our present misery. The only comfort, I repeat, is that everybody I have met here is aware that the Europe of 1934 to August, 1939, cannot be reestablished when the war ends.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS *and the* ARTS

Notes by the Way

A FRIEND of mine used to run his desk on the principle that if you kept a letter two weeks it answered itself. If you keep a book three months it doesn't review itself, but it may become timely again; and in the light of events in India, "War Without Violence" by Krishnalal Shridharani (Harcourt, Brace, $2.50) has more news value than when it appeared. Mr. Shridharani gives an excellent account of the genesis and history of *satyagraha.* What will interest Western readers even more is his description of its technique, his comparison between war and *satyagraha* as alternative methods, and his suggestion, tentative but persistent, that it has practical meaning for the West.

Mr. Shridharani emphasizes that *satyagraha* is not simply non-resistance but a form of direct action which proceeds in orderly, specific steps from negotiation and arbitration to demonstration and ultimatum, to economic and social boycott, to non-payment of taxes, to non-cooperation, to civil disobedience, and finally to parallel government. He says it has much more in common with war than with Western pacifism and offers it as the "equivalent discipline" postulated by William James. "So far war has been the only force that can discipline a whole community," said James, "and until an equivalent discipline is organized, I believe that war must have its way." Mr. Shridharani makes a very ingenious comparison between war and *satyagraha.* Like war it is based on direct action; it is an instrument of aggression; it appeals to the instincts of self-sacrifice and courage; it is an organized institution; it exercises compulsion; but whereas war coerces through inflicting violence, *satyagraha* compels by refraining from violence, by suffering the violence of its opponent and thus disrupting his morale. Finally, "there being no spirit of punishment or revenge, *compulsion* does not achieve the extent of coercion. It stops with effecting what Gandhi calls 'a change of heart,' and the consequent 'redress of wrong.' As a result, the opponent is not vanquished but victory comes to both sides. *Satyagraha,* therefore, does not entail the vicious circle of defeat and revenge," which has been the end and worst product of most wars, including the class war.

Plenty of arguments rise to confute this counsel of sweet reasonableness. It is pretty well drowned out just now by the roar of guns in the new thirty years' war that seems to be under way in Europe; in India *satyagraha* is a practical method because India's millions are conditioned to it by religion and temperament and because, having no weapons, their only recourse is to some such method—yet even in India *satyagraha* has not achieved its aim of independence. It seems pretty unlikely that it can be developed in the West if only because it is hard to imagine a Westerner keeping his hands folded until the fingernails grow through the palms—that has been done in India.

On the other hand, *satyagraha* has certainly won important victories over the British raj. Gandhi stopped the process in 1930 before it had reached the stage of parallel government; so we have no way of knowing whether those Indians are right who maintain that they have the power to carry through, though we can be pretty sure that there would be violence on the British side. As for the West, Mr. Shridharani points out that non-violent direct action in the form of strikes and boycotts has been common; he also notes that with the increasing concentration of armed power in the hands of government the millions of the West have come into much the same predicament as the unarmed Indians.

I don't look for any immediate development of *satyagraha* in the West. Neither, for that matter, does Mr. Shridharani. But whatever the relevance of *satyagraha,* one thing is clear. Large sectors of Western opinion have come to feel, like the Indians, that violence is its own reward. War with violence has lost its moral prestige. It is no longer a glorious venture but a dirty business. It is in the light of this shift in the attitude toward war with violence that the conception of war without violence takes on interest, especially if one agrees with Gandhi that struggle, that is, war, will continue to be a constant in human affairs.

As a companion volume to "War Without Violence" there is a short biography of Jawaharlal Nehru by Anup Singh (John Day, $1.75) which gives an account of one of the most intelligent popular leaders of our day. Unlike Gandhi he is a convinced socialist. He is an agnostic, yet has a tremendous prestige in religious India. He has been influenced by the Russian "experiment" but rejects its means-end philosophy and totalitarian violence. He is a leader who fears the leader principle. It seems to me that he is much more likely than Gandhi to carry the method of *satyagraha* to its final revolutionary conclusion. Aside from all this, he is an appealing figure merely as a human being, a product of India and the British Empire who is likely to wield an enormous influence on the future of both.

THREE WEEKS ago I quoted Carl Sandburg's remark that the story of Lincoln and his period "has lamentations and beatitudes enough to make an American Bible." It also contains at least one interesting study in literary composition. Here is a paragraph (1) as written by Seward and (2) as revised by a writer named Lincoln:

> I close. We are not, we must not be, aliens or enemies, but fellow-countrymen and brethren. Although passion has strained our bonds of affection too hardly, they must not, I am sure they will not, be broken. The mystic chords which, proceeding from so many battlefields and so many patriotic graves, pass through all the hearts and all the hearths in this broad continent of ours, will yet again harmonize in their ancient music when breathed upon by the guardian angel of the nation.
>
> I am loath to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break, our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone, all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AS A CHILD I was told that my grandfather read the Bible in three languages and didn't believe a word of it in any of them. I wish I could send him a copy of "The Bible of the World" in which all the infallible words of most of the infallible religions are set side by side. (Edited by Robert O. Ballou, Viking, $5.) He would appreciate the irony. . . . The British, it seems, are suffering from a shortage of brass buttons for uniforms and are temporarily substituting bone. Bone seems to me more practical. It will be a nuisance raking up all those brass buttons. MARGARET MARSHALL

Danube Mosaic

WORLD WITHOUT END. THE SAGA OF SOUTH-EASTERN EUROPE. By Stoyan Pribichevich. Reynal and Hitchcock. $3.50.

EMIL LENGYEL in his recent work "The Danube" presented a very objective picture of the Danube Valley as seen, so to speak, from above. Reading "World Without End" is like exploring the same part of the world—and far south to the Mediterranean, east to the Black Sea, and north to the Sudeten—on foot, following many back roads. We see in detail the landscape of which we got an interesting panoramic view from Lengyel's scouting plane. Stoyan Pribichevich is an excellent guide. He knows every stone and many people. He wants us not only to see as superficial tourists do but to understand and to learn and to bring home the kind of knowledge which will be useful wherever we live. He is always scholarly but never tiresome. His heart is engaged. He arranges our journey through the past history and present reality of the Balkan countries with the artist's sure sense of what makes for drama, suspense, and refreshment. When the journey comes to an end—under a clear sky, on a mountain top with a view into the Danubian federation of the future—one feels that one would like to travel the same route again, stopping longer at certain places. This book is not to be read merely once.

In Part One we are given complete histories of the Danube nations from prehistoric times until the present. The complicated interwoven fates of the Czechs, Hungarians, Croats, Serbs, Turks, Greeks, Albanians, Bulgars, Rumanians, Jews, gipsies, and German settlers are spread out with great skill, not only their political past but their whole underlying cultural development. Part Two, The Life and the Mind, deals with the present and future. After a survey of the political and economic organization of the Balkans the author digs deeper and deeper. He analyzes the classes and their relation to each other; he does not merely deal with them as categories, however, but always in terms of the concrete human beings he knows so well. We come really to understand how a Croatian peasant or a Montenegrin woman feels and thinks, and why. Many pages of this book could stand alone as studies in character or social behavior. All aspects of life are presented—poetry, music, the dance, sex. The story becomes fuller and fuller from page to page, and in its course hundreds of revealing stories are incorporated in such a way that one never has the unpleasant feeling that an anecdote is being inserted.

The author of "World Without End" is the son of Svetozar Pribichevich, leader of the southern Slavs in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and later Premier of the new state of Yugoslavia. Under King Alexander the elder Pribichevich went to prison for his democratic convictions and later died in exile. The son seems to have inherited his father's political temperament. He is not content with the reporter's job. Every page of his book reveals an urge, youthful in the best sense, to find meaning in the great struggle he describes so vividly. He reports and interprets and plans. He has character and conviction, and he does not try to hide them behind a false objectivity.

In a most exciting chapter, Peasant Renaissance, he surveys the exploitation—and the awakening—of the peasantry all over the world. The perspectives of this chapter alone would be enough to keep one sleepless the whole night, even after one has discounted the author's appealing but romantic bias for the peasant, which reminds one of the mystic love of the first socialists for the proletariat. He believes, and has many good arguments to support his belief, that the next turn of history will see the peasant coming into his rights through political and social democracy and—the "Good Neighbor cooperatives." He cites many hopeful examples of the progressive work of the party of Croatian peasants which recently succeeded in bringing Yugoslavia back on the road toward democracy. In this context the polemic against Marx seems unjust. One quotation from "Capital" seldom proves anything, and the fact that modern peasant movements owe a debt of impetus to the labor movement is not given consideration. It is also misleading to compare the proportionately higher living standard which the skilled worker enjoys today after a great and costly struggle with the living standard of illiterate peasants. If one compares their lot with the workers' lot at the beginning of industrialization, the difference disappears. It would have been interesting to have an analysis of the historical reasons for socialism's fateful neglect of the exploited peasant and for its misunderstanding of his psychology.

"World Without End" breathes a healthy optimism in spite of the thoroughness with which it pictures the unsuccessful struggle over thousands of years. The author gives an eloquent statement of his faith that the democratic system—which is not more than 150 years old—will be victorious over reactionary authoritarianism. His style is lucid, exact, and full of suggestive overtones. When he speaks of his homeland he sometimes achieves the poetic intensity of the first hundred pages of Louis Adamic's "The Native's Return."

FRANZ HOELLERING

Spanish Testament

IN PLACE OF SPLENDOR: THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A SPANISH WOMAN. By Constancia de la Mora. Harcourt, Brace and Company. $3.

ALMOST every foreigner who sat in on the slow murder of the Spanish Republic got to know Constancia sooner or later. If one wanted a pass to visit the front, an interview with some unwilling official, or even just a little information, it was always "See Constancia." Officially, she was Luis Rubio Hidalgo's assistant at the Foreign Press Office—until the gov-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ernment moved to Barcelona, when she succeeded Rubio as chief and showed how efficiently the office could be run. Privately, she was the wife of General Ignacio Hidalgo de Cisneros, head of the Republican air force, and the granddaughter of Antonio Maura, the patriarchal Prime Minister of the last days of the monarchy.

"In Place of Splendor"—a title which strikes me as singularly inappropriate—tells how Señorita de la Mora made the difficult transition from the stuffiness of her aristocratic youth to the scorned independence of a business woman at the age of twenty-five, supporting her small daughter Luli on her meager earnings in a peasant art shop. Brought up in a fashionable convent in Madrid, she first tasted freedom at (of all places) St. Mary's Convent, near Cambridge, England. There she wanted to go into business with a Mexican woman, whose family in Spain was quite as distinguished as her own but who, in spite of it, kept a dress shop. She was not very surprised, however, when her pious mother came traipsing up to Cambridge to take her back to Madrid to make a "brilliant" marriage.

As it turned out, her marriage to Manuel Bolín of Málaga was neither "splendid" nor "brilliant"; it lasted four unhappy years while her husband did his best to squander all her money. Embittered and resentful, she finally broke with her husband, her family, and her church—it was a sin to be separated and unheard-of to be divorced—and went back with her little daughter to Madrid, where presently she met Ignacio Hidalgo de Cisneros. They were married a year later, after Constancia had obtained one of the first divorces of the infant republic, and went to live in Rome and then Berlin, where Cisneros was sent as air attaché to the Spanish embassies. They did not return to Spain until just before the electoral victory of the Popular Front, in February, 1936. Meanwhile, as air attaché, Cisneros had been silently observing the plotting against Spain in both fascist capitals, and reporting it in detail to Indalecio Prieto, his chief, who made light of it in his Paris exile, Señorita de la Mora says, and did nothing to counteract it after his return to Madrid.

The last half of her autobiography is devoted to the war years, 1936-39, and this should have been the better portion of the book. Unfortunately it is not. For despite a good running account of the war, seen from her position as propagandist, wife, and mother, Señorita de la Mora betrays the stoppage of her growth as an individual and her subjection to a party line. War itself does this to people, I know; but sooner or later even erstwhile officials find an opportunity to tell the unvarnished truth—and what else is of value, now that Spain is lost? The Communist Party, however, transcends wars, and its adherents can never ignore the line for long. Far from ignoring it, Señorita de la Mora lays it on so thick in the last half of her book that one can predict her every opinion in advance. Everything Prieto does in the war is wrong; everything Negrín does is right; and this seems to me not only debatable but mathematically impossible. Prieto is condemned for using his position to send his daughter out to France to escape the rigors of the war; yet Señorita de la Mora sees nothing wrong in the fact that she later sent her own daughter out to Russia, or that Dolores Ibarruri had a grown son there all through the war. Luis Araquistain and Francisco Largo Caballero are painted as unprincipled scoundrels—which they weren't; while Juan Negrín, Julio Alvarez del Vayo, and La Pasionaria are seen as saints—which they weren't. This sort of sectarian distortion extends even to the reporting of events. Of the rearguard clash of May, 1937, to cite but one of dozens of examples, Señorita de la Mora naively writes: "The P. O. U. M. militiamen, the Trotskyite heroes who had played football with the fascists . . . started for Barcelona, this time in dead earnest about the fighting. They intended to slaughter the people of Barcelona on the streets—as they had never slaughtered fascists." Nonsense. There were fascists in the P. O. U. M., certainly, but there were fascists in the P. S. U. C. (the Communist Party) too—in every party. The P. O. U. M. had no monopoly on spies and ogres any more than the P. S. U. C. had a monopoly on heroes and saints.

In the long list of names that appear in the book, I am surprised to find that Señorita de la Mora has not once mentioned Aurora Riaño, her loyal assistant, or José María Quiroga Plá, her equally loyal chief censor. Both Señorita Riaño, who always did the heavy work, and Quiroga, who was diabetic, and ought to have been in a hospital instead of the censor's office, stayed on until the end, long after Constancia herself had abandoned the Foreign Press Office. They never left Spain until they were literally bombed and shelled across the French frontier—yet their heroism receives no mention in her book. Even so, "In Place of Splendor" is worth reading, if only for the first portion, which is excellent. But a thorough, candid account of a Spanish government worker in the war is still waiting—and begging—to be written.

LEIGH WHITE

The Poetry of Mark Van Doren

COLLECTED POEMS, 1922-1938. By Mark Van Doren. Henry Holt and Company. $3.50.

THE "Collected Poems" of Mark Van Doren show that the poet's manner was formed as soon as he had found his material. The manner is remarkable in that, almost alone among his contemporaries in this country, Mr. Van Doren shows no trace of French influence. He is in the English tradition; his master, we can hardly doubt it, Dryden. He has the ease of Dryden, as he has the sanity; though he has always clarity he does not have a comparable radiance. He has his own grace, but does not give that sense of inexhaustible strength which, more than anything else in Dryden, contributes to the impression of manly nobility. Mr. Van Doren is more easily resigned. He has come late to the English tradition, as he is rather belated in coming to his particular New English material. The style he has made for it is properly autumnal and dry. But if we should by any chance be about to complain that it has the dryness of an October cornstalk, it is then we discover, under the dry rustle of the long leaves, the authentic golden grain. Mark Van Doren is extremely prolific; and yet his poetry is presented, amid his verse, with a sparse hand. Nevertheless it is always there.

The enormous influence of the French poets of the nineteenth century on contemporary American poetry is easily accounted for if we remember that these poets were the first

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to explore the effects on the sensibility of a civilization in which, with each decade, industry played more and more the predominant part. It cannot be too often said that what the Symbolist poets sought was not an escape from the life of their times. What they sought was life; they could only report where it failed. The poetic means which they created to that end corresponded to the exasperation of nerves which accompanied the hunt, the distraction of the mind, the extremity of the heart that came with its failure. There was not one of the great Symbolist poets who might not have declared, as the last of them did, that his aim was to write of his race and of reality. That, it is true, is also Mr. Van Doren's intention. It is significant that in adhering to the English tradition, which he has adapted to the uses of a modern sensibility with no small skill, he has been constrained to take as his peculiar province a place where industrialism has not apparently penetrated. It has, of course; only in that portion of Connecticut that is Mr. Van Doren's poetic property, it does not look like industrialism. It looks like death.

And yet, having made his choice, how honestly Mark Van Doren has held by it! He is a completely integrated person in an age when all we have known disintegrates. He seems while young to have become accustomed to the fact that his own particular world was already lost. And these things make him not altogether of our time. He is not solitary, but remote. The region into which he takes us is one where "Time smiles at us and rests his heels."

His poetry proceeds from the New England air and like it is both harsh and delicate. And like that atmosphere it lends itself continually to fine perceptions; it has its own clarity, which may perhaps conceal, as the district it celebrates, how intricate its thought really is. Mr. Van Doren's corner of Connecticut may now appear old, harmless, and mad. It was not always so.

For New England is more than a section of the country; it is a peculiar spiritual climate. And it may well be that they will weather it best who, like Mr. Van Doren, were born and nurtured in the Middle West. The native New Englander, if he happens to be a poet, will probably revolt like Cummings against Concord, Cambridge, and all their works. He will escape as rapidly as possible and yet continue to breathe, with full lungs, upon its furthest confines of air. The Middle West was settled by New Englanders who sought less inclement elements and hoped to find an earth not so frugal with her children. Across country they carried a spiritual culture, and the Middle West has no other. It is a soulless region. The Middle Westerner must either be content to get along without a soul and record, as Hemingway has done, all the circumstance of living without an inner life, or he must look elsewhere. It may be that he will return, as Mark Van Doren has done, to New England. The old landscape is still there. Much in Connecticut is permanent. And yet it is a land that men have abandoned. The poet looks at what was once a farm to see a fallen barn whose timbers the rain will soon sink into sod.

> Nothing remains
> Of what it was that made these beams a barn.

This country around West Cornwall was where a man once could say:

> I can go home. I can be my own master.
> I've got a house now, a little patch of corn,
> A plow, and a shed, and a one-eyed mule;
> As ignorant and poor as I was when I was born;
> But I'm my own pauper and I'm my own fool.

That was the self-reliance of the sixties. But that was long ago. Now, where there were such men, is

> No corn upon an aged trembling hand.

To look for the genius of the place is to find, in a poem appropriately called "Spirit,"

> A straight old woman, tall and very pale,
> Moving from room to room of a musty house
> No voice is ever heard in.

It is a land, not only abandoned by its men, but of men abandoned by their gods. (Mr. Van Doren's "American Mythology" is not about gods, but about folkways, which he calls by the names of gods.) It is a land of death and resignation to the approach of death by way of a dragged-out living, which is no longer desperate and scarcely tragic, which is, in fact, no longer much of anything.

That Mr. Van Doren loves this land almost every page of his bears witness. Though he is without romantic illusions about it, he finds in these hills somehow his proper surroundings. He makes them the landscape of his spirit. It is the land of his poetry. Out of it he has made much, for it is his by choice. He comes there to write his "Winter Diary," and it is a charming account, in most skilful couplets, of a cold season spent there with his family, playing at being snowbound. For it is play. The snow that falls is real. But the

There are 64 VALUES in LAFAYETTE'S Radio Line

Whatever the radio you have in mind—portable, table model, automatic radio-phonograph combination . . . whatever the price you choose to pay, Lafayette has the set for you, and offers more for your money. More wanted features, more realism of reproduction, more cabinet beauty, more *fine quality* throughout. There are *sixty-four* distinguished models in the Lafayette line for 1940 — every one a *value!* Send *today* for Catalog No. 78S describing the complete line.

LAFAYETTE RADIO
100 SIXTH AVENUE • NEW YORK, N. Y.
542 E. Fordham Rd. . . BRONX, N. Y. | 24 Central Ave. . . . . NEWARK, N. J.
90-08 166th Street . . . JAMAICA, L. I. | 110 Federal Street . . BOSTON, MASS.
901 W. Jackson Blvd. . CHICAGO, ILL. | 265 Peachtree Street . ATLANTA, GA.

USSR and FINLAND

THE USSR AND FINLAND
HISTORICAL ECONOMIC POLITICAL
Facts and Documents

The whole story clearly told, with map, documents and little known facts. 64 pages, only 5c. Copies at progressive bookstores or from

SOVIET RUSSIA TODAY
114 East 32nd Street, New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Van Dorens, not being farmers, not being cut off whenever they like from escape, only pretend to be confined by the long cold. But it is for them, as for the reader, a pleasant pretense.

When so much has been given of New England, it seems ungrateful to ask for more. But what is lacking here is something that went out of the region long ago and whose loss was set down with incomparable intensity by another poet who was completely aware of what had gone.

> The missing All prevented me
> From missing minor things.
> If nothing larger than a World's
> Departure from a hinge,
> Or Sun's extinction be observed
> 'Twas not so large that I
> Could lift my forehead from my work
> For curiosity.

That is the authentic New England note, not self-reliance, which before and after Emerson could be carried away, but the soul sufficient to itself. That is the note. But we can scarcely blame Mr. Van Doren that he has come too late into the country to hear it. For none since Emily Dickinson has heard it. It is no longer there.

The capacity for tragic action, which is continually present in Emily Dickinson's verse, is gone. And the strain of loss is over. What is left has assured Mark Van Doren a singular tranquillity and enabled him to write his elegies of New England.

JOHN PEALE BISHOP

Handbook for Boat-Owners

SEAMANSHIP BELOW DECK. By Ruth Brindze. Harcourt, Brace and Company. $2.50.

IN THE past two years yacht builders by force of necessity have taken to building small, well-put-together, yet relatively inexpensive cruising boats to meet the pocket of the sea-minded moderate-income group. The success of these boats in the past season, from the Chesapeake Bay to Maine, has resulted in substantial additions to the sailing fraternity. To the many newcomers in this group, both captains and first mates, I suggest Miss Brindze's book as a Christmas present; it will be an excellent starting-point for discussion on winter evenings, when the boat is up on dry-dock but not far from the captain's mind.

The author has evidently done more than her share of sailing, and writes with authority on the inner functionings of a ship. The care of galley and cabin while at sea and the choice of articles to be carried are excellently handled. The problems of lighting a small ship adequately are well stated and solved. Notes on winter care are exceptionally timely and correct. The book is also a mine of information on clothing for on and off watch, time-tables, weather-bureau reports, cooking suggestions—all thoroughly indexed. The author must have kept either a notebook or a dictaphone handy for quite a few years, and stirred up many a discussion with old salts. To those who know the joys of the sea, here is a book to be read with much pleasure. For the neophyte, it furnishes a large-scale chart of the numerous rocks and reefs that threaten the comfort, if not the safety, of life on the water.

HUGH H. DARBY

DRAMA

Christmas Suggestions

"DU BARRY WAS A LADY" (Forty-sixth Street Theater) pretty well lives up to expectations. The public anticipated something lush and lavish and lewd as well as hilariously laughable, and that is just about what it gets. Cole Porter has written cleverer lyrics and more ingenious tunes than any in the present show, but none have ever been more skilfully delivered than these are by Ethel Merman, happily at her superb best. Moreover, Bert Lahr has never been funnier. The role of a washroom attendant who dreams that he is King of France and can (unfortunately) do no wrong with Du Barry fits perfectly his horrid talents. I know of no one who can make quite so much out of something subtle like an arrow in the rear. Add dazzling investiture as well as a lot of pretty girls who dance extremely well, and you have about everything anyone could want in such an entertainment. Perhaps, however, there is just a little bit more of one thing than some people want—namely, a few jokes just a little bit dirtier than is absolutely necessary. I am not referring to those which are agreeably fleshly; I mean those which strongly suggest what burlesque shows use to fill in with. Possibly one remark given to Miss Merman when her lover is under the covers doesn't mean what I thought it did. Possibly it is just the fault of an evil mind. All I can say is that probably one of us ought to be arrested.

Those who would like to see "Hellzapoppin'" (Winter Garden) again have the excuse of a new edition. The general confusion being what it is, I am not sure that I can always distinguish what is new from what is old, but there is one incident which is certainly an addition and is rather terrible. A man in a diver's helmet and suit crosses the stage with a furled umbrella. "Who's that?" "Mr. Chamberlain." "Where's he going?" "To review the British fleet."

Hamlet. Forty-fourth Street Theater. Return engagement of Maurice Evans in his faithful production of the almost uncut play.

Key Largo. Barrymore Theater. Maxwell Anderson's brooding study of a man who cannot forget that he did the reasonable thing when his comrades were heroically unreasonable. In verse and one of the author's most ambitious attempts. I like it very much, but it is only for those who are willing to take Mr. Anderson seriously.

Life with Father. Empire Theater. Very adroit dramatization of Clarence Day's sketches about the unreasonable man whom his family adored. One of the three best plays of the season.

Morning's at Seven. Longacre Theater. Comedy of small-town life in America but much more original in tone than that suggests. Gentle and funny, not at all sentimental, and a very encouraging augury for the future of its author, Paul Osborn.

The Man Who Came to Dinner. Music Box Theater. The Kaufman-Hart farce-comedy about the serpent-tongued sentimentalist whom everybody is supposed to recognize

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Louis Fischer on RUSSIA

Don't Miss an Issue!

•

And there is still time to avail yourself of the Holiday Gift Rate:

First Subscription $5

Additional Subscriptions $3 each

This offer good until January 15 only.

A sensational series of three articles:

RUSSIA'S COUNTER-REVOLUTION

beginning in next week's issue of THE *Nation*

What has happened inside the Soviet Union since 1936 that has made the land of peace and socialism an aggressor and an ally of Nazi Germany? Did Stalin make his pact with Hitler out of self-defense? Did he fear another Munich or did he abandon the Allies precisely because he knew there would *not* be another Munich? What really broke up the anti-Comintern bloc? • Louis Fischer writes with the authority of the insider. For twelve years he lived and worked in the Soviet Union and was long one of its outstanding champions. What he has to offer is not an emotional blast or naive indignation over a revolution that has gone bad overnight. It is a carefully reasoned, documented account of the changes that have come over the U. S. S. R., starting with the breach between government and people and culminating in the attack on Finland.

MAIL YOUR SUBSCRIPTION TODAY

THE NATION 55 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK, N. Y.

Please enter *The Nation* subscriptions as indicated below. Bill me after January 1 for $..... I enclose check for $.....

.....*Years* .....*Weeks*	.....*Years* .....*Weeks*	.....*Years* .....*Weeks*
Name.....	*Name*.....	*Name*.....
Street.....	*Street*.....	*Street*.....
City.....	*City*.....	*City*.....
☐ Send Gift Card	☐ Send Gift Card	☐ Send Gift Card

Donor..... *Address*.....

RATES: 1 Year, $5.00 2 Years, $8.00 3 Years, $11.00 10 Weeks, $1.00

Extra Postage per Year: Foreign, $1.00; Canadian, 50c

12-23-39

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as a good deal like Alexander Woollcott. It is the most popular play of the season and very laughable, but far too mechanical and slick for my taste.

The Time of Your Life. Booth Theater. A playful and delightful fantasy on realistic themes which could not possibly be by anyone except the irrepressible Saroyan. Even those who have resisted the author on previous occasions like this. To my mind the best play of the year.

The World We Make. Guild Theater. Sidney Kingsley's dramatization of the novel by Millen Brand about a young girl who recovers her sanity by running away from a sanitarium to mix with people whose problems are not mental. Genuinely interesting.

Too Many Girls. Imperial Theater. Lively musical comedy by George Abbott, Richard Rodgers, and Larry Hart. Shares with "Du Barry Was a Lady" first place on the list of musicals. Innocently fleshly but less unsuitable than the other for maiden aunts. JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

RECORDS

A READER writes to add her "little bit" to what I wrote about N. B. C.'s barbarous handling of Beethoven's quartets: "Each Sunday I listen to the New Friends of Music on WJZ between six and seven. No matter what is being played, they interrupt it for station announcement promptly at 6:30." I recall being outraged by this practice last year; and that station identification does not have to be made rigidly on the half-hour is shown by the fact that C. B. S. does not do this in its New York Philharmonic broadcasts, nor N. B. C. in its Toscanini broadcasts. I also recall occasions last year when the New Friends broadcasts were cut off at 6:45—once, infuriatingly, in the middle of one of the fine Haydn symphonies.

The New Friends concerts themselves have continued to offer occasionally something as fine as the Beethoven String Quintet Opus 29 played by the Budapest Quartet and Primrose, but for the most part inconsequential, dull works like the two Beethoven Trios Opus 1, in which there was fine ensemble playing by Nadia Reisenberg with members of the Budapest Quartet, or the Beethoven and Mozart Quintets for piano and winds and Beethoven's "Kakadu" Variations for trio, in which Webster Aitken did some superlative piano-playing that deserved better music and one or two better associate artists. As for other concerts, writing after Zadel Skolowsky's New York recital debut Olin Downes correctly appraised his "pianistic talent, well trained, fluent, musical," and correctly pointed out his need of further study and playing, but failed to use this occasion, as he might, to point out the situation which Skolowsky faces: the commercialized concert world which does not provide a talented young artist with the opportunities for playing that are the stimulus and the economic wherewithal for study.

Composers, too, are better off writing under the stimulus of performance, but not, as American composers have contended, necessarily better. Koussevitzky proved this at his opening New York concert with works as bad, in their composers' various ways, as Arthur Foote's Suite, Walter Piston's Concertino, and Roy Harris's Symphony No. 3. After these the first movement of Randall Thompson's Symphony No. 2, engagingly energetic and unpretentious, was a pleasure; but later movements added nothing to what was said in the first.

Victor has devoted two sets to American music. The first (M-604, $6.50) offers a number of fine early American ballads and one—"I Wonder as I Wander"—that is breath-taking, all excellently sung by John Jacob Niles. The second (M-608, $8) offers music by a few of our older sophisticated composers—Paine's Prelude to "Oedipus Tyrannus," Chadwick's "Jubilee," MacDowell's "Dirge"—which testifies to their talent and ability to produce music that is well put together and well-sounding—though Paine's is inadequate to his subject. The set also includes the work of a young contemporary, Kent Kennan's "Night Soliloquy," which I do not find impressive; and Griffes's fine "White Peacock." The performances by the Eastman Rochester Symphony under Howard Hanson are good; but I recall Barlow's Columbia record of "The White Peacock" as better. From Victor there are also Toscanini's superb recording of Rossini's Overture to "William Tell" with the N. B. C. Symphony (M-605, $3.50) and Yella Pessl's recording of K. P. E. Bach's Württemberg Sonata No. 1 (M-606, $4.50), which is not important. And from Columbia there is a set of Beethoven's String Trio Opus 9, No. 1 (M-384, $5), which was completely uninteresting as played by Mr. Piastro and his associates at a recent New Friends concert, but which acquires life, charm, and humor in the performance of the Pasquier Trio.

Several of Marian Anderson's early European recordings have been issued here under the new Royale label (ten-inch, $.75): "O mio Fernando" from "La Favorita" (1763); "Adieu, forêts" from Tschaikovsky's "Jeanne d'Arc" and "Amour, viens aider" from Saint-Saëns's "Samson et Dalila" (1764); the spirituals "Heav'n" and "Sometimes I Feel Like a Motherless Child" (1765). The voice is fresher than on recent records and is recorded acceptably; occasionally the recording or surface is noisy.

The same company has had the good sense to have Jess Stacy make records with a well-chosen small band for its Varsity label ($.35). In the best performances, "Noni" and "Jess Stay" (8076), Stacy is heard only briefly; in "What's New" and "Melancholy Mood" (8064) at greater length. But in "The Sell Out" (Commodore 1503, twelve-inch, $1.50) Stacy plays alone and superbly for almost five minutes. I prefer this to "Ec-Stacy," with its lush Eastwood Lane chord progressions, on the reverse side. B. H. HAGGIN

WINTER TERM REGISTRATION NOW GOING ON
Classes begin Monday, January 8
COURSES: Marxism-Leninism — World Politics — Current Events — History of the C.P.S.U. — Principles of Communism — Political Economy — Dialectical Materialism — Historical Materialism — American History — European History — Labor History — Post-War America — Trade Unionism — Labor Journalism — Public Speaking — Science — Literature — Soviet Democracy Negro Question — History of Negro People — Jewish Question — Women and Society — English — Russian — Spanish — Write to school for catalogue
WORKERS SCHOOL, 35 East 12th Street, N. Y. C. Tel.: AL 4-1199

Buy Your Books Through The Nation

THE NATION will deliver any book to your door at the regular publisher's price (postfree) provided payment is received with the order or publisher's price plus postage if sent C. O. D.

The Reader's Service Division
The Nation • 55 Fifth Avenue • New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters to the Editors

Let the Public Speak Out!

Dear Sirs: Theoretically, it appears correct that the true will "compete successfully with the false in the intellectual market-place," as you stated editorially in *The Nation* of November 18. But the market-place in radio is already controlled both by the broadcasting industry and the government.

The abolition of chain broadcasting will not help the situation. The large networks have been increasingly generous in making time available for the discussion of public issues. The smaller independent stations, according to their contracts with the networks, are compelled to accept only commercially sponsored programs produced by the networks; they are free to accept or decline sustaining programs. Break up the networks and there is little exchange of ideas.

Mr. Lerner's "TVA yardstick" suggestion will not further the purpose. Liberals conversant with the problem realize that government ownership, or even operation, is a dangerous approach that might easily lead to a result opposite to that sought. *Vide* Germany and Italy. Moreover, who would listen to a station devoted solely to educational, artistic, and controversial subjects? A further difficulty, apart from the cost, is that of acquiring effective radio technique. The Federal Department of Education, which should be sympathetic to a government-operated channel, has acknowledged that the success of its present programs is largely attributable to the assistance of commercial broadcasters in the preparation of program material. Again, competent speakers will not often welcome opportunities to broadcast if unpaid. Today the most effective political commentators obtain commercially sponsored engagements. Were I to desire to advance an idea I would prefer the half-hour on Sunday nights between Jack Benny and Charlie McCarthy to several hours daily on a government-owned station, dedicated to educational programs.

If competitive government stations were established, the broadcasters would feel themselves relieved of the obligation to give time for the discussion of ideas and would again feel free to sell time for the broadcasting of opinions. The powerful and organized majority opinion would buy time from the large, popular networks. Minority opinion would have to content itself with speaking to smaller audiences on the free government channels. The danger of government control of programs is evidenced by the Federal Communications Commission's recent attempt to circumscribe the content of international short-wave programs.

An attempt to meet the problem was made by the broadcasters themselves through the adoption of the National Association of Broadcasters' code. This aims to increase the broadcasting of controversy by providing equal opportunities for at least two representative opposing points of view and by prohibiting the sale of time for the discussion of controversial subjects except during political campaigns. A strong opposition to the code is at present disturbing the industry, largely because, it is alleged, such refusal to sell is censorship. It may be censorship, but it is equally censorship when a Henry Ford, through a Mr. Cameron, can propagandize, without restraint or affording opportunity to answer, or when the price for time is such that it can be paid by a large corporation but not by its employees. If the refusal to sell time to anyone is censorship, it may be that Mr. Lerner is right in saying that there can be no liberty without some restraint.

The safest and surest way to extend freedom of expression on the air is to widen the public consciousness of the danger of its loss and by vociferous expression of a demand for more and broader opportunities to challenge the broadcasting industry increasingly to fulfil its obligations as a semi-public utility. The companies realize that their success and the maintenance of their franchises depend on giving the public what it wants. They will respond to articulate demand.

HENRY J. ECKSTEIN

New York, December 7

Footnote to "Ninotchka"

Dear Sirs: "Ninotchka" is not a good picture—far from it—nor is it just a bad one. It is far worse than that; it offends common human decency, but so gracefully that one is hardly aware of the offense. It invites you to laugh with it while it poisons your humanity.

When those who are responsible for "Ninotchka" poke fun at the idealistic girl portrayed by Garbo, they do not satirize communism or Stalinist tyranny; they ridicule every honest effort to better man's lot. When Garbo says that the week's rental of the luxurious Parisian hotel suite would buy seven cows for Russia's peasants, that isn't funny; it is true. Nor is it funny to compare the wealth and extravagance of Paris with the frugality and primitiveness of Moscow in a way that implies that the Russians prefer it that way.

Of course we have seen slick, well-directed, well-acted pictures of no great moment before, but I doubt if there ever was one which combined quite the degrees of competence and viciousness to be found in this one. It is difficult to believe that anyone who had the intelligence to make such a picture could be unaware of its fundamental corruptness.

FRED C. RODEWALD

New York, December 12

Friends of the U. S. S. R.

Dear Sirs: It may interest you to know that I have received many letters praising my letter defending the U. S. S. R. which you printed on November 4. Only three were from persons I knew or have ever heard of. Theodore Dreiser made the following comment: "Your article is excellent. I intend to send it on to others." R. C. Davies, of Hartwick College, Oneonta, New York, chairman of the County Committee of the American Labor Party, wrote: "Bravo, I have silently agonized while my fellow-liberals have fallen for the anti-Stalin hysteria."

I was astonished when friends showed me the reprint of my letter on the editorial page of the *Daily Worker*. It shows that sincere, well-informed people can quite independently arrive at the same conclusions as the Communist Party.

I hope that *The Nation* will continue to print letters and articles supporting Soviet policy and opposing the present war maneuvers in Europe, which I firmly believe are nothing more or less than mobilization for a general war against the Soviet Union.

RUTH E. KENNELL

Palo Alto, Cal., December 9

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nazism in Wagner

Dear Sirs: In your columns a teapot tempest has been raging over the propriety of Mr. Haggin's sensing something very "Nazi" about Wagner's Siegfried music. (I refer to *The Nation* of September 23 and October 28.) In defense of your music critic, I cite a brief passage from Thomas Mann's new nine-page analysis of Wagnerian politics, written in reply to my current articles in *Common Sense* on Hitler and Wagner:

> I go a little farther than Mr. Viereck. I find an element of Nazism not only in Wagner's questionable literature; I find it also in his music, in his work, similarly questionable, though in a loftier sense—albeit I have so loved that work that even today I am deeply stirred whenever a few bars of music from this world impinge on my ear.

These words from Germany's greatest living writer and noblest anti-Nazi should go a long way toward justifying Mr. Haggin's obiter dictum on Wagner for your readers.

PETER VIERECK

Cambridge, Mass., December 9

Those Roosevelt Buttons

Dear Sirs: In his article on Lewis and the Third Term in *The Nation* of November 25 Richard Neuberger declared: "Sweetland states he wrote to Costigan for a new supply of 'Draft Roosevelt' buttons and received no reply." Our records show that the order was for 250 buttons and that on November 18 we sent to the Oregon Commonwealth Federation 155 buttons—all we had left out of an order of 70,000. We did not feel that Mr. Sweetland's interest was sufficient to justify us in ordering more buttons, since three months previously we had sent him 1,000 buttons and had had no further word from him. The order for 250 buttons, received from Mr. Sweetland in November, was not sufficient to change our deduction that the Draft Roosevelt campaign was at no time pushed in the state of Oregon.

TOM RABBITT,
Chairman, Draft Roosevelt Drive,
Washington Commonwealth Federation

Seattle, Wash., December 15

Labor's Neediest Cases

Dear Sirs: The annual Christmas Drive for prisoners and for labor's neediest cases is now under way. Men robbed of civil liberties, women living on starvation rations, children without shoes—these will be the beneficiaries of our drive.

For fourteen years the International Labor Defense has been sending checks for cigarettes and other small comforts each month into the penitentiaries and workhouses where labor's prisoners are confined. It has also sent relief and clothing to mothers and wives who struggle to exist without their breadwinner. There have never been less than two hundred prisoners and members of families receiving such relief.

The children of these prisoners look forward each year at Christmas time to gifts of toys and clothing and candy. Women, desperately hoping to keep their families warm and fed, await our gifts and messages as eagerly as do the children.

Please send donations to drive headquarters, International Labor Defense, 112 East Nineteenth Street, New York.

VITO MARCANTONIO, President

New York, December 15

Clarence Darrow

Dear Sirs: One of the most stalwart defenders of civil liberties in America was Clarence Darrow, whose biography I am now writing. There must be many among the readers of *The Nation* who knew him and fought side by side with him in his cases and causes. If these people will send to me anything they may have in the way of letters, documents, or memories of Darrow which they feel will illuminate his life and work, I shall be most grateful. All documents will be safely returned.

IRVING STONE

Encino, Cal., December 7

Haym Salomon, Patriot

Dear Sirs: The Patriotic Foundation of Chicago is interested in hitherto unpublished material relating to the life of Haym Salomon, the "forgotten patriot of the American Revolution," in connection with the preparation of a new document on Salomon for the forthcoming completion of Lorado Taft's heroic memorial depicting George Washington, Robert Morris, and Haym Salomon, to be erected in the city of Chicago.

If any of your readers are in possession of documents or other material dealing with Haym Salomon, will they communicate with the Patriotic Foundation of Chicago, 33 North La Salle Street. All communications and documents will be returned to their owners intact. We are particularly interested in any letters or memoranda signed by Haym Salomon himself, or personal communications written by his friends and members of his family.

BARNET HODES, Co-chairman

Chicago, November 25

For Fred Beal's Release

Dear Sirs: The Non-Partisan Committee for the Defense of Fred E. Beal takes this opportunity to inform his friends and well-wishers that efforts are being continued unremittingly for his release, with prospects that are distinctly encouraging. Those who desire to express their good-will toward Beal in the spirit of the Christmas season may send gifts or letters to him at the Caledonia Prison Farms, Halifax, North Carolina.

The efforts exerted thus far and the work entailed in the future necessitate an appeal for funds. May we urge readers to send their donations to our office, Room 610, 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York.

HUGO POLLOCK, Secretary

New York, December 18

CONTRIBUTORS

G. D. H. COLE, an outstanding social theorist and the author of many important books on British social and economic policy, is University Reader in Economics at Oxford University.

ROBERT DELL, *The Nation's* and formerly the Manchester *Guardian's* correspondent at Geneva, is now on a lecture tour in this country.

RUSTEM VAMBERY, noted criminologist and sociologist, was a member of several Hungarian government ministries and committees. He is now on the teaching staff of the New School for Social Research in New York.

ROBERT JORDAN is making a study of industrial conditions in Ohio.

LEIGH WHITE, an American journalist, drove an ambulance in Spain for some months and acted as a translator for the Loyalist government.

JOHN PEALE BISHOP has published two volumes of verse, "Now with His Love" and "Minute Particulars."

INFORMATION FOR SUBSCRIBERS

THE NATION, 55 Fifth Ave., New York. Price, 15 cents a copy. By subscription—Domestic: One year $6; Two years $8; Three years $11. Additional Postage per year; Foreign, $1; Canadian, 50 cents. The Nation is indexed in Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Book Review Digest, Dramatic Index, Index to Labor Periodicals, Public Affairs Information Service. Two weeks' notice and the old address as well as the new are required for change of address.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED